

PROCEEDINGS

2008 NCAA® CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS



102nd Annual Convention
January 10-14, 2008
Nashville, Tennessee

PROCEEDINGS

2008 NCAA® CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS



102nd Annual Convention
January 10-14, 2008
Nashville, Tennessee



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222

Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222

317/917-6222

NCAA.org

July 2008

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

©2008 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association

Opening Business Session

January 13, 2008

The opening business session was called to order at 4 p.m. by NCAA Executive Committee Chair Michael Adams, president of the University of Georgia.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Adams: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to add my welcome to each of you for the opening session of the 2008 NCAA Convention. I am Michael Adams, president of the University of Georgia, and I currently have the pleasure of serving as the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee.

We have a large crowd, but there are a number of seats on my right and your left. Positions on the left are completely appropriate for faculty. So if you would like to move in that direction we would be happy to have you join us.

I have the pleasure of moderating this opening session and welcoming you on behalf of the Board to Nashville. As you go about your business at the Convention, you will see many communication platforms. These include television and print, and outdoor advertising being used in a multiplicity of ways to highlight the unique values of what President Myles Brand has described as the collegiate model of athletics.

Speaking of the NCAA president, from whom we will hear from in a few minutes, it is my pleasure to introduce several of the people who are providing outstanding leadership for all of us at the NCAA, but certainly not the least of whom is our president, who has served us so well for many years now. Join me, please, in welcoming President Myles Brand. (Applause)

Also with me today on the dais are my colleagues who are chairs of the Divisions I, II and III presidential governing bodies of the NCAA. First of all, I am pleased to welcome James Barker, president of Clemson University and the chair of the Division I Board of Directors. He will be joined by Dr. Charles Ambrose, president of Pfeiffer University and chair of the Division II Presidents Council. Dr. John Fry, is the president of Franklin & Marshall College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Join me, please, in thanking these three gentlemen. (Applause)

We are very fortunate as an Association that both Drs. Barker and Fry will continue to serve as the chairs in the coming year. However, given the rotating nature of the Board, Division II will have new leadership in 2008. I want to especially commend President Ambrose for the leadership he has exhibited in leading Division II to heights greater than any of us have seen before. I know he will continue to remain involved in Association activities. I know how much time and energy goes into leading a division and board over a two-year period. Join me now in his last official act in thanking President Ambrose for his service. (Applause)

ASSOCIATION-WIDE LEGISLATION

ORGANIZATION — EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE — DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Our first order of business today will be to consider an Association-wide proposal relating to the Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities. This proposal is listed as 2007-12 on Page 9 of the Division I Official Notice; Proposal 9, EC-1 on Page 1 of the Division II Official Notice; and Proposal No. 1 on Page 1 of the Division III Official Notice. For those of you who do not have a copy of the Official Notice, the text of the proposal appears on the screens around the auditorium. Please note that voting delegates will need their voting machines.

Assisting me on the stage should issues arise will be Georgana Taggart, our parliamentarian, and Bernard Franklin, who is the staff liaison to the Executive Committee.

[Note: Speaking privileges and voting procedures were explained.]

This amendment, like any amendment to our operating procedures, requires a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting for passage. We will use the electronic voting devices that you have been provided to tabulate the vote for the proposal.

[Note: The electronic voting devices were tested.]

We are now ready to consider this proposal. I recognize delegate Paul Tribble to present the proposal.

Paul Tribble (Christopher Newport University): Good afternoon. On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I move the Association-wide proposal regarding Executive Committee duties and responsibilities.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies the Executive Committee's existing authority to adopt and implement policies. It does not change the duties of the Executive Committee. It does not expand the Executive Committee's power or authority. It merely clarifies the Committee's existing policy to implement policy.

The NCAA constitution charges the Executive Committee with overseeing Association-wide issues under Article 4.01.1. This includes the ability to act on behalf of the Association, to resolve core issues and Association-wide matters. This action includes the ability to adopt and implement policies to resolve these matters.

Why, then, is there a need for a legislative amendment if authority already exists? The answer is our lawyers say so. Legal counsel has advised the Association to add this language to state expressly that the Executive Committee may act on behalf of the Association by adopting and implementing policies to resolve core issues and other Association-wide matters. It is important to note that this proposal relates solely to the Committee's ability to adopt policy. It does not grant legislative authority where that authority does not currently exist.

For example, the Association-wide matters that constitutionally require legislative action, such as membership restructuring, will not suddenly be within the purview of the Executive Committee. I encourage your support of this proposal.

Jackie Campbell (Atlantic 10 Conference): I am the associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference and currently chair the Division I Management Council. I urge your support of this proposal.

It is important to underscore that it does not change or broaden the role of the NCAA Executive Committee under existing provisions to act by adopting and implementing policies. However, for legal reasons, it is important that we clearly and explicitly state this authority within the language of the constitution. This helps avoid the opportunity for adverse litigators to make creative arguments in a court setting.

Again, I would note that the proposal does not extend the Committee's current authority and does not grant legislative power where none exists. Actions that have traditionally required a legislative vote of the membership will continue to do so.

The presidents on the Division I Board of Directors and Divisions II and III Presidents Councils support this proposal as a clarification of the role of the Executive Committee.

Todd Hutton (Utica College): Could you or someone provide another example of the types of policies that this provision would enable the Executive Committee to pass and another example of the types of restrictions upon the Executive Committee acting on behalf of the Association?

Mr. Adams: The best response I can give you is the one that has already been given by President Tribble. I will see if Bernard Franklin or anyone else wants to add to that. We have received advice from both NCAA counsel and outside counsel that this is basically a technical and clarifying proposal that vests more clearly in the Executive Committee a power that we believe already exists, and particularly in a way to allow us to do business to settle lawsuits effectively and to represent the Association when various matters of this type come up.

Our best advice was that this was little more than a clarifying and technical explanation. If anyone wants to add to that ... I am advised by Mr. Franklin that that is an adequate explanation of what we are doing here. I will be happy to have any other questions or comments in that regard, if there are any. Does anyone else wish to speak on this? Hearing none, we will vote.

[Proposal No. 2007-12 was adopted, 535-4-5.]

I declare the motion passed and now part of the NCAA policy. I thank all of you for your cooperation and help in this regard.

I should inform you that parliamentary procedures do allow for a motion to reconsider before the close of the business session, and anyone who voted on the prevailing side may move to reconsider a vote. If such a motion were to be made, the delegates would vote first on the motion to reconsider, and if that were to pass, the delegates would re-vote on the original proposal.

Hearing no such motion, the action of the group is final and we thank you for your cooperation in that regard.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS REPORT

Mr. Adams: As has been the tradition during the opening business session for several years, the NCAA honors athletics staff members and student-athletes who have passed away during this past year with a Memorial Resolutions report.

A communication was sent to all of the directors of athletics and conference commissioners about an electronic link to the NCAA Web site for names of individuals from an institution or conference whom we have lost during the calendar year 2007.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance that we receive each year from NCAA staff members Sharon Tufano and Josh Centor in compiling the list.

At this time, I would like to ask you to look at Pages 59 through 63 of your Convention Program, which include the names of those institutional staff members associated with athletics and student-athletes who passed away in 2007.

It is always risky in some four-page list to draw attention to a single individual among those who we will note today, but indeed we desire to do just that. There are individuals in many ways whose contributions over time we believe warrant special notice.

One of those individuals was the late Alan Chapman, an engineer by training, teacher by profession and a parliamentarian by avocation. Alan was as comfortable applying the laws of Robert's Rules of Order for this Convention — as he did for many years — as he was applying the laws of physics in his classes for his students. He was a former president of the NCAA, was the Association's parliamentarian for more than 30 years, guiding delegates like you through the sometimes tricky and often murky waters of amendments-to-amendments, reconsiderations and of the old paddle era days of "mootnicity."

Although he served in a number of key leadership roles, Alan Chapman will be remembered as a master of protest that brought integrity and authority to the cumbersome parliamentarian procedures of producing national policy.

Joining us today are Alan's wife, Marjorie, and Alan's daughter, Katherine. I would like to ask them to join me at the bottom of the steps, where I have the distinct honor on behalf of the Association of presenting them a plaque as a symbol of our appreciation for the great service that the Honorable Alan Chapman provided to this Association.

If they would come forward at this time, please ... (Applause)

In addition to the loss of Mr. Chapman, there are a number of others, and we would ask you to remain seated while we recognize on the screens the individuals who have passed away in the past year. I suspect that each of you, like I, saw on that list close friends and acquaintances that we have lost in the last year.

In honor of them, I would like to ask everyone in the room, please, to stand now and observe a moment of silence for those men and women who have passed away since we last met. Will you join me, please, in a moment of silence.

[Note: The delegates observed a moment of silence.]

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. You may be seated. In what is a proud tradition, we make every effort to ensure that the list is complete, but if for any reason you know of persons who should be added to the list, contact any member of the national office staff and they will be happy to make adjustments to that list.

REPORT OF NCAA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It is customary at this point in the opening session each year for the chair to present the report of the NCAA Executive Committee. I will do that in very brief fashion today.

As many of you know, the NCAA federated governance structure allows each division the autonomy to address its varied issues. However, it is important for us to keep in mind that we gather annually at this Convention as one Association.

The NCAA Executive Committee is comprised of 16 presidents and chancellors from the three divisions, the president of the NCAA, three non-voting members, and the chairs of the Management Councils of Divisions I, II and III. The Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities include approval of the Association's budget, oversight of Association-wide issues, initiation and settlement of litigation and employment of the NCAA president.

With that in mind, I can report to you briefly on what has been a busy and productive year for the Association. As you know, we have just concluded the first Association-wide vote at this Convention since the NCAA was restructured in 1997. The constitutional amendment you voted today clarifies the Committee's authority in setting policy and triggered an editorial revision to Bylaw 18.1 that adds those governing bodies to groups administering NCAA championships.

In other business, the Executive Committee has received progress reports since April from the working group established to review Association-wide membership matters and oversee the development of specific membership models.

There are multiple opportunities to scrutinize membership models at this Convention. The time line for a membership vote on those various models continues to be January 2009, with a likelihood of a two-year implementation period if the legislation is adopted. The Committee noted that about 70 percent of the stated goals in the plan have been accomplished and the vast majority of the others are well underway.

Members expressed a desire to maintain momentum by conducting periodic reviews of the strategic plan. To that end, the Committee agreed to appoint a subcommittee to consider whether modest revisions to the plan are necessary in the next few years.

We have had a very successful and productive year. The finances of the Association, the legislation of the Association and the general condition of the Association, we believe, is in as strong a condition as it has ever been.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

We move now to what I consider to be the most important moment of the NCAA Convention — the State of the Association address. The person who will give that address in just a moment is, in my opinion, the person most responsible for the financial health, the legislative health and the overall goodwill that the NCAA enjoys today.

Our colleague has served as a university president at both Oregon and Indiana Universities. He has been an athlete, administrator, and for several years now, has directed this Association's affairs in a way that has literally received applause across our great country.

To most of you, he is not only a colleague, but a friend and a person we are all indebted to for his strong leadership. Join me, please, at this time, to present the State of Association address — the president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand. (Applause)

Myles Brand (NCAA President): Thank you, President Adams, and welcome to you.

In the first decade of the 20th century, General Palmer Pierce, superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and the first president of the then newly formed NCAA, would stand before the delegates to the annual Convention, just as I am standing before you today.

General Pierce would open each Convention by reading to the delegates the purposes for the Association as set forth in its constitution. He would read them as a reminder of why the delegates were gathered and why the

organization existed. He would read what has become known today as the Association's basic purpose. It read then:

"Athletic activities in the colleges and universities of the United States shall be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education."

It would be amended a few years later to establish that "intercollegiate athletics are to be an integral part of higher education and the student-athlete an integral part of the student body."

The message and purpose are the same and speak to us in the same way today. It was no accident that General Pierce insisted on reminding the delegates to the Convention of the role of college sports and the NCAA within higher education. He understood and wanted to reinforce the idea that in America, colleges and universities connect athletics to education.

A century later, in the first decade of the 21st century, I am here to remind all of us that, as the theme of this Convention notes, the NCAA is a higher-education Association. It is focused, naturally, on intercollegiate athletics. But the context in which it serves its members is clearly that of higher education.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association is dissimilar to the professional leagues. The critical difference is that those who participate in our athletics events are students and students first. They undertake athletics training and competition in support of their education.

The NCAA's members are primarily universities, and as such the universities' educational mission is controlling its athletics activities.

So, how are we doing? What are the issues and challenges we face? What is the state of intercollegiate athletics in 2008?

The relationship between intercollegiate athletics and the university is reciprocal. Intercollegiate athletics is dependent on the university. It could not exist in its present form without institutions of higher education.

But at the same time, the university gains advantages, oftentimes significant advantages, by the inclusion of intercollegiate athletics on campus. When all is working properly, the university and its athletics programs are made stronger by this reciprocity and interdependence.

Unfortunately, there are also issues and problems that detract from intercollegiate athletics maximizing its success and the university failing to take full advantage of its athletics programs. These issues and problems present challenges to overcome.

Athletics programs and universities themselves are accustomed to overcoming challenges; indeed, they are practiced and good at it. If these challenges are properly identified, and if there is genuine cooperation and effort in designing and implementing solutions, then the full advantages of a well-functioning and successful athletics program can be realized by the university and the university can advance on that basis.

Today, I want to focus on what I see as the four key roles that intercollegiate athletics has within the context of higher education. I will also articulate some of the concomitant challenges and point toward approaches that should yield resolutions.

The four key roles of intercollegiate athletics in the university context are these:

- (1) Intercollegiate athletics provides educational value;
- (2) Intercollegiate athletics helps create community on campus;
- (3) The university is helped by college sports in meeting its obligations to engage the world beyond the campus; and
- (4) Intercollegiate athletics contributes to social justice.

Let me begin by discussing how college sports provide educational value. Athletics departments, in all three divisions, have the obligation to ensure that those who participate in intercollegiate athletics have a realistic opportunity to receive an excellent education at their university or college.

There should be no barriers imposed by athletics participation toward being well-educated that cannot be overcome by careful planning and hard work by the student-athlete.

While there are time commitments imposed by travel and practice, an opportunity for academic programs of high quality is a sine qua non for all intercollegiate athletics programs. The obligation of the athletics department is to provide a genuine opportunity for student-athletes to take advantage of the institution's academic offerings,

and to motivate and incite a commitment to academics.

In truth, not every student-athlete, just as not every student on campus, fully applies himself or herself to academic study. The good news is that the vast majority of student-athletes do apply themselves to the task of becoming educated. It is for this reason that student-athletes on average graduate at higher rates than the general student body.

We have hard data for Divisions I and II. In Division I, student-athletes graduate at 62 percent compared with the general student body rate of 61 percent; and in Division II, they graduate eight percentage points higher than the general student body. Clearly, intercollegiate athletics serves the mission of the university by encouraging and promoting academic success.

But the educational value of intercollegiate athletics goes beyond the classroom. An undergraduate education, most especially for traditional-aged students, encompasses more than the learning that takes place in the lecture hall, laboratory and library.

Of course, that learning is at the core of the college education and it is the central reason to attend college; however, it does not exhaust the important learning that occurs during the several years a young woman or man attends a university.

A college education also prepares students for a successful life by guiding them and forming attitudes and life plans that enable each of them to be excellent family members, productive contributors to their community and engaged citizens.

A college education grounds young women and men by enabling them to internalize the values necessary for happy and fulfilling lives.

These skills for life include especially the drive to pursue excellence, knowing how to lead and to follow, respect for others, even when they are competitors, the commitment to hard work; learning how to focus, learning how to persist despite obstacles, and knowing the importance of team and group effort.

Consider persistence in the face of obstacles. Most students who fail to complete their degrees are unable to overcome the barriers presented by the transition from high school to college. It is the first year, most often the first semester or the first six weeks, in which many students become alienated from their school and environment. They fail to develop supportive social networks and to become engaged in their academic course work. It is not long thereafter that these students leave the institution.

By contrast, consider student-athletes. Some of them, no doubt, feel the same alienation when transitioning from home life to a seemingly impersonal environment. But their teammates and coaches, and advisors and administrators, are assisting these students in developing a support network; in identifying goals and helping them understand how to pursue them; and especially, learning the personal values of persistence and pride in overcoming difficulties.

Not only does that lead to continued enrollment, but it establishes a healthy pattern of behavior and commitment to values that has positive effects on character development.

There are, of course, other means than through athletics to learn these skills and attitudes. But intercollegiate athletics leads to learning these life skills as well as any other alternative on campus, and indeed better than most and with a significant rate of success.

Extensive recent surveys of both currently enrolled and former student-athletes confirm the power of intercollegiate athletics to teach life skills and to have long-term positive effects for those who participate in sports.

Nonetheless, there are serious challenges facing universities in their attempts to maximize academic and life success for student-athletes.

I will focus on Division I and particularly the high-profile sports, where the challenges are most overt, though they are replicated in other sports in other divisions.

This focus also reflects the recent approach to academic reform undertaken by the NCAA. Creation of the graduation success rate (GSR) and academic progress rate (APR) are significant new tools to help athletics programs and member institutions in Division I determine how successful their student-athletes are in the classroom.

The Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) and the Division I Board of Directors have worked hand-in-hand to establish the “team” as the new unit of analysis, rather than only the student-athletes, as in the past.

The Board has put these new matrixes in place and has determined sanctions when standards are not met.

In order to provide adequate notice of these changes in matrix, and to collect sufficient data, teams were given the benefit of the doubt through adjustments for four years.

By late this spring, however, there will be adequate data and sufficient notice so that these adjustments can be fixed.

Overall, teams and athletics programs have responded well, and noteworthy academic progress has been made. That is not the case, however, for every team in every sport. Unless there are changes in the near future, several men's sports will see substantial numbers of penalties.

Wrestling, baseball, football and men's basketball face the most sanctions. Since the goal is to change behavior, to enable young men to achieve academically, and not to sanction and punish, the national office is working with many of these teams and their athletics departments to create plans for recovery.

In a number of cases, though not all, there are circumstances that can be corrected within a reasonable time frame that will eliminate the problems leading to academic underachievement.

Additionally, individual sports are addressing issues specific to them that lead to systemic academic underachievement. Baseball was the first to complete a self-diagnosis and make recommendations for change. Men's basketball is pursuing a similar course of action, and wrestling and football are also exploring similar options.

I am optimistic that significant progress can be made in many of these cases to reverse current academic underachievement. But there will be sanctions.

Some teams will not meet the new academic standards. The Division I Board of Directors understands that change must be pressed, and it recently went on record to re-affirm its commitment to academic reform.

The need for competitiveness and the interest in winning must be coupled with a commitment to assist and encourage student-athletes to succeed academically. It is not competitiveness or academic success; it must be both.

Creating this balance is not easy, and it deserves continuing attention. The professional leagues have no parallel balance to create. For them, winning is everything.

But our task in higher education is different, and frankly more difficult. Because of the increased expectations of academic achievement for student-athletes, a number of specific challenges arise.

We want to continue to recruit the students for our teams that we have in the past, provided that, with adequate assistance, they can be successful academically.

As it is sometimes said, we do not want to change the "zip code" of those who we recruit. Our challenge is to make clear the academic expectations of our institutions to athletically talented young students early in their high school careers.

Two sports in which this is especially pertinent are men's basketball and football. We need to help young men at an early age, and help their families and advisors understand that admission and eligibility are dependent on both academic and athletics preparedness.

We are working with others, including the National Basketball Association, USA Basketball and the National High School Federation, to provide guidance and structure to youth basketball.

It is a complex situation, and not one in which we can regulate outcomes. We must find a way to capture the attention of these young men in a crowded marketplace.

We must, at all costs, refrain from setting up young players for failure. It is exploitive to bring young men or women into college sports when they have little or no chance for academic success.

In sum, this is a challenging year in Division I for academic reform as the transition to the new requirements for academic achievement is put fully into place. Every team and every sport must make the grade.

I want to turn now to the second key role for intercollegiate athletics, helping to create community on campus.

Universities are diverse institutions. They include young men and women from many backgrounds with many points of view and faculty members and administrators with divergent histories and life experiences.

Finding common ground among all these persons, not to mention the institution's alumni and friends, is not simple. But it is crucial.

To be successful in creating a learning environment in which students can prosper requires a sense of belonging, a sense of community. While there are multiple focus points for campus community, there is one that has unusual power in creating and sustaining community. And that is athletics.

Earlier we spoke of the role of athletics in helping student-athletes bond to the institution, especially at the crucial early phase of their college careers.

A well-functioning athletics program also has that effect for the entire student body, and often beyond the students to the faculty and staff. It even has this effect for the off-campus constituents, the alumni and university friends.

Intercollegiate athletics provides effectiveness in the marketing of universities in all three divisions. There is no question that universities compete with each other for potential highly qualified students, faculty and friends and donors. They tell their stories — market themselves — in print ads, billboards, television and radio spots, and in many ways.

In particular, athletics provide a good platform for universities to send messages to prospective students, and not just athletes and the public. A well-conducted, visible athletics program attracts favorable attention. That is obvious when there is broadcast time for Division I sports.

But it also works for Divisions II and III. When an institution recruits regionally for the general student body, a successful athletics program can provide marketing that the university could not otherwise afford.

Of course, a poorly conducted athletics program, one that has academic issues or rules violations, can have negative consequences in recruiting for the general student body.

It cuts both ways. Thus, there is pressure on universities to have athletics programs that represent them well not only for athletics reasons, but because of the marketing potential of these programs.

It is not necessary to have “big time” intercollegiate athletics to reinforce campus community. We see it in Division III, in institutions that have modest attendance at games and little media coverage.

In a good number of Division III institutions, a significant portion of the student body is directly engaged in intercollegiate athletics, sometimes more than one-third of the student body.

High participation rates generate common ground on which students relate to each other and to the institution. However, it is possible to misread the role that intercollegiate athletics plays in creating community for the campus.

Division II has read it correctly. Division II is succeeding in positioning athletics so that it becomes a point of pride and engagement on campus.

Through the leadership of the presidents and chancellors, these institutions are using athletics to provide identity on campus and in the surrounding community.

They stress that those who participate in intercollegiate athletics intentionally chose to attend the institution. Athletics becomes a positive cause around which to rally.

Division II schools are using sports as a catalyst to build pride and loyalty. It is impressive to observe this moment in Division II.

On most Division I campuses, and certainly on the larger campuses, the proportion of students who participate in intercollegiate athletics is five percent or less. Those student-athletes enjoy the advantages of belonging to a community within a large university.

But the entire campus also gains this advantage. Indeed, this sense of association and bonding with the institution goes well beyond the campus, given the national media attention to athletics in these schools. Fans across the country are able to identify with the team and the university because of this broad access.

Now, that access is available digitally on multiple platforms, from one’s home computer to hand-held devices, the ability to follow and to identify with the teams and the institution is increasing.

American college sports fans are among the most avid in the world. There is little, if anything, in this country that produces feeling of affiliation with our institutions of higher education the way athletics programs do.

Some people feel uncomfortable about this role of athletics in the university and would prefer that the fondness for the university would emanate from other, more academic sources.

It is easy to understand this concern, and I can relate to it. Yet, the fact of the matter is that in a large num-

ber of cases, intercollegiate athletics draws more attention to a university than anything else. That attention leads to bonding on campus and it drives local community, as well as stimulates virtual community.

The pace of contemporary life often makes it difficult to form and sustain community. Our sense of community has diminished even though our need for it has not.

Aristotle said that persons are social animals, and that is no less true today than it was in ancient Greece. But today, we travel too far and too fast to enjoy the daily conversation in the town square.

Many find a sense of community online, especially through social networks. Nonetheless, there remains a strong need to share the same physical space and bond directly with others. Coming together to cheer for the home team helps satisfy that need.

College sports are often the magnet that brings the diverse campus population together. Intercollegiate athletics, conducted properly, can stimulate and reinforce community on campus. The larger the campus, the more there is the need for commonality. It is on the large Division I campuses, especially, that intercollegiate athletics has the role of creating community.

But Aristotle also said that virtue is the mean between extremes, that virtue requires balancing excesses. In the case at hand, intercollegiate athletics can create community through fan interest; but too much fan interest and over-enthusiasm can lead to poor sportsmanship, or worse.

It is not acceptable to have celebratory riots, to engage in behaviors that are harmful to persons and to property. That is a community that evolved into mob behavior.

It is certainly more fun to win than to lose. But winning in the right way is essential. Popular cultures make heroes out of those who say that winning is everything.

Some overzealous boosters hold the view that coaches who don't cheat aren't trying. Some will be so focused on winning that they will break the rules that are established to promote fairness.

At worst, academic rules are broken in order to ensure that student-athletes remain eligible. Whoever does that, in whatever circumstances, commits academic fraud.

I put those who believe "winning at all costs" is just the price of athletics success in the same category as the mob that sets fires at a rite of celebration.

Cheating and unsportsmanlike behavior should not be tolerated. Academic fraud violates the fundamental bond that links intercollegiate athletics to higher education and should be dealt with aggressively and harshly.

It is not a sign of weakness to follow the rules and act with respect for others; it is a sign of moral commitment.

The NCAA and all its members and constituents must articulate and reinforce fair play and respectful behavior surrounding our games.

Unsportsmanlike behavior destroys the community that intercollegiate athletics naturally builds. It creates discord and acrimony. Our challenge at the local and the national levels is to promote sportsmanship, to eliminate destructive fan and participant behavior, to find the right balance between over-enthusiasm and apathy.

The desire to win can also lead to less dramatic but similarly unfortunate circumstances when a university over-expend in athletics. Budgetary decisions about athletics, as in any area in the university, in the final analysis, are the province of the president and his or her board.

Almost every university subsidizes intercollegiate athletics. There is nothing wrong with such subsidies because intercollegiate athletics has educational value. But the amount of subsidy should not exceed the benefits that the athletics program generates for the university, educational and otherwise.

That is the equation the president and the university board must solve. The danger is that the enthusiasm that yields campus and alumni community can become overwrought and lead to expenditures that are not prudent and detract from the academic mission of the university.

The report last year by the presidential task force on the future of Division I intercollegiate athletics addressed this issue and recommended steps that would ameliorate the problem.

In particular, it recommended, and the Division I Board of Directors approved, changes in the accounting for

revenues and expenditures, together with transparency in the aggregate, so that presidents and their boards are in the best possible position to make informed financial decisions.

The national office has been collecting institutional financial data in the new format and reviewing it for accuracy. We will shortly release to institutions that information, including trend data that we have come to call “dashboard indicators.”

The collection of this data and its appropriate categorization will remain a work-in-progress for several years, as we refine our accounting definitions and data collection process.

The overall goal is for institutions to carefully review their rates of expenditure increases and make sound financial decisions for the future of intercollegiate athletics and their campuses.

In sum, intercollegiate athletics provides striking opportunities to build community on campus and, in some cases, regionally and nationally. This is clearly a worthy goal.

But this community, built on the desire to see ones team do well can become destructive if it is not balanced. It can lead to celebratory riots by students, recruiting violations by alumni and friends, academic fraud on campus, and over-expenditures on athletics, all to the detriment of the university’s mission and goals.

Besides a sound regulatory environment and proper enforcement, the best approach in this area, as well as others in intercollegiate athletics, is to focus on balance.

Intercollegiate athletics at its best advances the values and goals of higher education, but at its worst it harms its host, the university, and its athletics department.

We have seen that intercollegiate athletics has educational value in preparing student-athletes for leadership and sound citizenship. We understand and appreciate that college sports can create community for the campus and understand our responsibilities in that regard.

What role does intercollegiate athletics play in helping higher education meet its obligations to engage the world beyond the campus?

Contemporary American universities and colleges have evolved distinctive features that set them apart from their brethren abroad and from their predecessors.

Arguably, this distinctiveness emerged strongly with the passage of the 1862 Morrill Act. In it, the federal government provided a grant of land in exchange for states establishing universities for the common man.

Before that, American universities and colleges tended to follow the pattern of England and focusing higher education on the clergy, the law and other areas of interest to the wealthy class.

The Morrill Act incited programs in the “A&M” fields, that is, agriculture and the mechanical arts, meaning engineering.

Over the years, this orientation led not only the public institutions, but also the private ones, to enroll students from a broad socio-economic band. As a result, higher education in America is far more accessible than it is in other countries, and a greater proportion of high school graduates receive at least some post-secondary education than elsewhere in the world.

Because of this population, American higher education began to reflect the interests and diversions of its student body. These common men, and eventually women, enjoy sports, including football, baseball and track, and in the 19th century, athletics came to the college campus.

Another result of this distinctively American approach to higher education is that the boundaries between higher education and the broader community broke down.

Universities may have been separated physically by ivy-covered walls, but the expectations of these institutions by the surrounding population were such that they must engage the world beyond.

Two additional changes began in the last half of the 20th century that reinforced engagement.

First, urban universities grew in importance. No longer were the rural, agricultural forms of engagement the only way for higher education to participate in the life of the community. They now had central roles in our cities, including working with low-income populations.

The second change is even more profound. Over the past half century, many of America’s social institutions came under criticism, often justified.

The business community was accused of excesses; the church experienced loss of moral authority because

of misbehavior by its clergy; the military, while highly respected, was placed in awkward and unwinnable positions; and our political leaders did not perform to the electorate's satisfaction.

But during this same time, universities and colleges were prospering. Though some faced challenges, by and large, they grew in prestige, recognition and expertise.

American higher education emerged as clearly the best in the world. As a result, many began to ask and expect universities to compensate for the loss of leadership and social service from America's other declining social institutions.

Many of our colleges and university leaders understood these changes well and moved our campuses toward even greater engagement. One obvious approach adopted by many is to become directly involved in discovery and then partnering to commercialize products; good examples came from the information technology and the health-care industries.

But engagement also involves reinforcing connectivity through college sports events.

There are two aspects of the engagement obligations of universities satisfied by sports events, promotion of community and support of economic development.

As mentioned earlier, the modern world, with its accelerating pace and its impersonality, exacerbated by new technologies, generates a sense of alienation that requires the counterbalance of community.

Unfortunately, there are fewer and fewer opportunities to build and sustain community.

The spirit and purpose of college sports helps fill this lacunae. Here are young men and women, in the midst of preparing themselves for life, giving their full efforts to win the game for their home college.

How can anyone resist identifying with that?

Thousands in the stands feel directly connected, and millions of others feel connected virtually through broadcasts. On-site experiences can be strong and lasting, but broadcast experiences can be addictive and lead to similar feelings.

This is clearly one way for universities to raise the spirits in the sense of community. Not everyone enjoys intercollegiate athletics, but an incredible number of people do, and as a result the university enhances the community's sense of self-worth.

Moreover, local events generate considerable new money for local merchants. Nationally televised games generate considerable new money for local merchants. Nationally televised games generate economic activity in the broadcast and advertising industries.

When all of college sports are added together, a rough but conservative estimate of the economic impact from college sports reaches \$10 billion annually, including direct expenditures by the institutions themselves.

Universities themselves, of course, do not reap all of these benefits. They accrue, rather, to local and national businesses, and that is fine.

Universities have an obligation in the contemporary world to assist with economic development, and sports prove to be one good way to do so.

The obligation to engage beyond the campus, financially and otherwise, is not the overriding goal of the university.

Nonetheless, American universities do have an obligation, even if it is secondary, to engage in activities that advance the well-being of their local communities and beyond.

To deny that is the case is to fail to realize the role of the contemporary university in American society, and perhaps to confuse these actual institutions with some idyllic version that no longer exists, if it really ever did.

However, engagement through college sports, even when undertaken for the right reasons, presents challenges.

We have already observed that the enthusiasm for the activity can create an imbalance, in that the primary university mission becomes blurred or worse.

There are universities that have sometimes succumbed to these pressures. There are not many of them and they do not do so often, but not nearly so many or as often as the critics of college sports would want us to believe, but it does occur.

Unfortunately, these instances tend to influence a popular negative perspective of college sports.

Aristotle's "golden mean" of virtue being a balance between extremes is again appropriate.

Too little engagement in the community fails to yield the positive effects and too much engagement detracts from the central academic mission of the university.

Each university, in its own environment, must find the proper balance point. Extreme positions on either side have no place in our deliberations.

Informed and principled decision-making is the order of the day.

Finally, I want to discuss the role of intercollegiate athletics in helping the university meet its obligations for social justice.

Universities, not uniquely but somehow emphatically, are committed to social justice. It is part of the very fiber of universities, indeed, to promote fair treatment for all persons.

That position derives from the role of higher education in American society.

Universities are committed to advocating for the benefits of hard work and taking full advantage of unnatural abilities. No other social institution in America better provides for the growth necessary to take advantage of these traits than higher education.

There is nothing more productive that a young man or woman can do than earning a higher education degree in order to advance in life.

Thus, in providing access to higher education, we open the doors to opportunity for all persons.

Intercollegiate athletics share with the university as a whole its commitment to social justice and to opportunity.

The most obvious way is to provide athletics grants-in-aid to young men and women to help pay for their college education.

Over the years, literally millions of low-income students were able to attend college and receive a degree because of athletics support.

The intellectual talent that has been enabled to flourish because of athletics support is nothing short of phenomenal.

Advancement in spite of class is but one way that college athletics has served the goal of social justice. Another way, even more visible, is by providing opportunities to women and ethnic minorities. But that took a while, and it is not complete.

In the case of opportunities for women, it was not until the passage of Title IX in 1972 that significant advancement occurred.

Before that time, few women had the chance to participate in intercollegiate athletics and to gain the financial support and life-skills learning that accompanies participation.

But since the passage of Title IX, there has been a six-fold increase in the number of women playing college sports. Even more importantly, girls and young women now in high school take it as a given that if they have the talent and work hard, they will be able to win a scholarship and play.

Within a generation, the culture has changed.

The fight for opportunity and access to college sports has been even more difficult for persons of color. The struggles of the middle of the last century to open the doors of American universities to African-Americans and others of color were wrenching.

The good news is that these battles were won; the bad news is that they had to occur at all.

But with the opening of the universities, African-Americans and other persons of color were freely able to participate in college sports.

Indeed, a strong argument can be made that the desirability of African-Americans participating in sports accelerated the changes in our universities.

Intercollegiate athletics became a visible symbol of access. When the Texas Western basketball team consisting of all African-American starters defeated the all-white Kentucky team at the 1966 NCAA tournament final, there could be little doubt that change was occurring.

Ability and hard work were becoming the guideposts.

In reality, however, these types of changes are not easily accepted, and resistance, overt and covert, remains

to be overcome.

There remain challenges to the full implementation of Title IX and from attempts to roll it back.

African-American student-athletes compete well in college sports, making up 63 percent of the Division I basketball teams and 55 percent of the football teams.

But there remain challenges for African-Americans in leadership positions, athletics directorships and head football coaches in particular.

There is work to be done to meet these challenges before we can claim that intercollegiate athletics generally demonstrates social justice.

Among the challenges on which we must focus is the full implementation of Title IX.

Women continue to be underrepresented in terms of grants-in-aid for student-athletes, coaching opportunities for women's sports, and leadership positions in terms of athletics director positions.

Athletics scholarships, coaching positions and athletics directorships must, of course, be allocated on the basis of talent and hard work.

But it is simply incredulous that the talent pool is so weighted toward men to produce this imbalance. The facts, as well as the history of past lack of female representation, point to a continuing problem of injustice.

Though different, the challenge facing African-Americans and other persons of color need immediate and strong action.

The number of African-American athletics directors in Division I is modestly increasing, but not nearly at the rate that accurately reflects the talent pool.

This situation is worse in Divisions II and III, where there is little evidence of even modest increases.

The lack of African-American head football coaches, frankly, is an embarrassment to all of intercollegiate athletics. The talent pool exists and it contains men who are ready and able to successfully lead these teams.

But we are yet to see more than eight head coaches among the 119 teams in the Football Bowl Subdivision. And as bad as that is, it is worse in the Football Championship Subdivision and in Divisions II and III.

Recognition of this problem has grown recently, and good leadership is emerging, especially among the Division I athletics directors and others.

But proof of change is in the actual appointments to these positions, and that has not yet occurred.

If intercollegiate athletics is to play its key role in higher education of helping promote social justice, as it should, then all of us, the NCAA national office and the over 1,000 universities it represents, must recognize the challenges and commit ourselves to meet them.

To take stock, I have been arguing that intercollegiate athletics is integral to and embedded in higher education. It is not an ancillary activity to which universities can turn for entertainment on Saturday afternoons or marketing at alumni events.

Intercollegiate athletics, rather, is part of the university, for better or worse.

This is the same philosophy articulated by General Palmer Pierce at the turn of the last century.

There is long-term consistency in the principles underlying college sports, even as universities and the external environment change and evolve.

In order to gain the advantages that intercollegiate athletics brings to the university, its roles must be well understood and promoted; and the challenges it faces in meeting the obligations that these roles generate must be met.

It is a great advantage for intercollegiate athletics to be woven into the fabric of the university.

Without this significant intertwining, intercollegiate athletics would devolve into professional club sports or something similar that occurs in countries that separate athletics from academics.

If that were the case, both universities and intercollegiate athletics would be worse off. But it is not the case: In America, universities and their athletics programs are joined together.

This is an extraordinary union, and let us celebrate it.

And I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Adams: Thank you, Myles, for your very thorough review of the State of the Association and the challenges that you present to all of us for the future.

For those of you who may want a copy of the address, we will make it available online at www.ncaa.org. The State of the Association address is also simultaneously being Web cast for media around the country.

I know that there will be positive responses in tomorrow's press to the sort of things that President Brand has shared with us.

I told him I particularly appreciate what he had to say in the social justice area of the speech. We have made progress in many areas, but that is clearly one that I think most of you would agree in which we could do better.

I hope that Myles has caught his breath, because I want to now ask him to return to the podium.

We present each year at this session the NCAA's highest award — the NCAA President Gerald R. Ford Award.

It is important, I believe, that he come and make that presentation. Join me again in welcoming Dr. Myles Brand. (Applause)

GERALD R. FORD AWARD

Mr. Brand: Thank you, again, Mike. Thanks for the kind comment on the speech.

It is my great pleasure to present the annual NCAA President Gerald R. Ford Award.

The award was created in 2003 to honor an individual who has provided significant leadership as an advocate for intercollegiate athletics and continued this over the course of his or her career.

Today's honoree more than exemplifies the requirement.

Gerald R. Ford served America as its President through one of the most tumultuous periods of this nation's political history.

He was a student-athlete at the University of Michigan, where he participated on the national championship football teams in 1932 and 1933.

It was there at one of America's great universities that he acquired the qualities that he exhibited throughout a career of public service.

Those qualities, integrity and discipline to purpose and sacrifice for the greater good, served him well in a presidency begun in controversy and requiring great strength of character.

But at a time when confidence in the office of the President and the role of the government was at a low ebb, President Ford healed the nation with his simple declaration, that our long national nightmare was over.

So it was.

He will continue to be an example of how participation in intercollegiate athletics can shape leaders in critical times.

Dr. James Frank, the 2008 recipient of the President's Award, is also an example of how intercollegiate athletics provides educational value to those who will participate and shapes them for leadership in critical times.

Indeed, James Frank represents the best of what a commitment to the values of athletics and higher education accomplish.

A student-athlete himself at Lincoln University of Missouri, Dr. Frank took the lessons he learned in baseball, track and field, and basketball, and played them to a career that included Army Lieutenant, basketball coach, college professor, dean of students, academic vice president, college president and conference commissioner.

Fortunately for the NCAA and its intercollegiate athletics, Dr. Frank also became actively involved in the Association and college sports.

At a time when college and university presidents felt it spelled doom, he ventured into the world of intercollegiate athletics.

He became the first sitting president to also be elected to head the NCAA as president.

Indeed, it was his vision for the role of leadership that presidents and chancellors in the governance of college sports that helped develop the first NCAA Presidents Commission and eventually the Board of Directors of the Presidents Council.

He was the first African-American president of the NCAA.

Dr. Frank forged the creation of minority opportunities and interests that would provide a voice for diversity

in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. He also advocated the cause for women's championships within the NCAA knowing that separate but equal does not lead to equality.

In 1983, he began what would become a 15-year commitment as commissioner of the Southwestern Athletic Conference and worked to enhance the recognition and role of historically black colleges and universities in intercollegiate athletics and in higher education.

In 2006, as part of the Association's centennial celebration, Dr. Frank was named to the list of the NCAA's 100 most influential student-athletes.

For 40 years, Dr. Frank has demonstrated what pursuit of excellence both in athletics and beyond really means.

Please join me as we watch this video of Dr. Frank's great career.

[Note: The delegates watched a video about Dr. Frank.]

RESPONSE BY DR. JAMES FRANK

James Frank: Thank you, president Brand, for those kind remarks. Needless to say, I am extremely grateful to be the recipient of this very prestigious award today. Of course, I consider it for my alma mater.

I want to say thank you to those people and institutions that have been significant forces in whatever success I have enjoyed.

The first group, of course, is family. I think we all recognize how important and how significant family is to an individual or to institutions.

The first person I had hoped to introduce was my wife, Zelma, of 49 years. We are planning to celebrate our 50th anniversary in July. She is here with me in Nashville. However, she hasn't been feeling too well the last two or three days.

I insisted that she see a doctor, took her to the hospital this morning, and the doctor would not let her out. He said that she had a slight case of pneumonia, but that she will be all right. So, I certainly will miss her.

With me today are my two sons, Troy, my youngest son, and Trent, my oldest son with his two children — Simian and Tracy.

Also, a very important person who is missing from the family is my daughter-in-law, Pamela. She lost her bout to cancer last September. To her, I say thanks, Pam. We really, really miss you.

We also have with us today my niece and nephew — Nishia and Terry.

I want to pay tribute to Lincoln University in Missouri, a place where the doors of opportunity opened to a four-year basketball scholarship. It was a place where I learned, coached, taught and eventually became president.

The university is now under the very capable leadership of Dr. Carolyn Maloney. Dr. Maloney, please stand and be recognized. (Applause)

Third, I want to pay tribute to Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts, where the emphasis is on the total man — the spirit, mind and body.

Springfield College was also a place of opportunity for me. The fellowship awarded while I pursued my master's degree and doctorate were quite helpful.

This institution is under the very capable leadership of Dr. Richard Flynn. Dr. Flynn, will you please stand and be recognized. (Applause)

I would pay tribute to Dr. Joe Johnson. You saw him on the video, former president of Grambling State and Tahlequah College. I worked very closely with Dr. Johnson. He hoped to be here today, but he called at the last minute and said he could not make it. Dr. Johnson was primarily responsible for me becoming the commissioner of the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Obviously, there are many other individuals who I could have appropriately recognized, but time will not permit this indulgence.

Standing before this NCAA Convention business session takes me back to January 1983, the last time I stood before a full business session of the NCAA nearly 25 years ago.

Some of you may remember the Convention was the beginning of the great debate on Proposition 48, the legislation that was designed to raise graduation rates and initial-eligibility requirements.

The debate on this issue was very passionate, intense and somewhat divisive. But before that 1983 Convention, the NCAA dealt with some very, very difficult issues, such as the property rights controversy in television, the involvement of women in the NCAA structure, Title IX, re-organization of the NCAA and presidential involvement.

I have reviewed the final comments that I made to the Convention at that time, and I think about things that are taking place in intercollegiate athletics today.

I believe the remarks that I made in 1983 are still relevant today and perhaps quite prophetic.

I concluded my remarks with the following statement:

“In my view, the overriding issue or problem in intercollegiate athletics is not an education, really not physical or economical, but it is more moral than anything else.

“What should characterize all of our theory and practices and what we do is right for students and for fellow human beings. The information factors are very crucial, but not as crucial as the morality issue. As college presidents, as board of directors, faculty athletics representatives, athletics administrators or commissioners, we have it within our capacity and within our power to correct what is wrong in intercollegiate athletics.

“There is no substitute for integrity, honesty and the highest standard of professionalism in all of our athletic pursuits. Emphasis on these values will go a long way toward eliminating the problem that we face in intercollegiate athletics.

“There is no substitute for the fervent and diligent exercise of our power, yes, of our right to stamp out the abuses whenever and wherever they occur.”

As I look back over the last 25 years, I am encouraged by the progress that has been made. Of course, as you listened to the State of the Association address by the president, that was very, very obvious.

I consider it a blessing and at times it appears that the biggest issue in intercollegiate athletics is the debate leading to the process of selecting the BCS champion or instituting a playoff.

This issue paled in comparison to the issues I have previously mentioned and what the Association may face in the future.

But through it all, I believe the Association has kept the welfare of the student utmost in its deliberations and decisions.

The challenge of improving the academic performance of students will always be with us.

Today, we have in place enforcement procedures to improve academic performance. I believe that the core of the president’s speech tonight was the strengthening of academic performance and, of course, the emphasis on the value of our intercollegiate athletics programs, making sure that it fits in and is consistent with the overall mission of higher education.

Certainly, this continues to be an issue for the Association and it probably always will.

Finally, in receiving this award, I was reminded of the impact athletics had on my life. I have some very, very vivid memories living in the steel mill city of Altoona, Pennsylvania, and that time is best captured from a poem that my youngest son, Troy, wrote when I retired in 1998 as commissioner of the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

It reads as follows:

“Young man from Pennsylvania hills,
barely shoes, barely clothes, barely food,
barely able to shield this child
from the winter’s bitter chills.

“Five brothers, two sisters and a mother he hardly knew.
She died. Yes, you did not grant him to the rule
for it was then that he learned
that life was as unpredictable as it would be predictable proven.

Yet, the father was still there,
the proprietor, taskmaster, stern hand,
and in the end, preacher.
“He, in his own way,
like the ice trucks after school,
basketball in December,
baseball on the Allegheny in June,
and the soot and grime of the steel mill,
which is now one of life’s pre-eminent teachers.”

I was that young man. I have reminisced about my life’s long involvement with athletics, how athletics has made my life richer, fuller and more abundant.

It was a four-year scholarship that opened the door of opportunity.

To paraphrase the great General Douglas MacArthur:

“I participated in the fields of courage and strife and reaped the fruits of success from that participation.”

I have been fortunate enough to be the recipient of many blessings. In return, all I tried to do was to give something back to the area that gave so much to me.

In closing, I am what the great coach, Eddie Robinson of Grambling University said:

“The greatest gift that one can give is to pass on your knowledge to someone else. That way, the knowledge will live on and on. If you keep it within, when you are gone, it is gone forever.”

As an athlete, educator, leader, teacher, coach, commissioner, administrator, college president and parent, I have tried to make a difference.

Again, thanks to the NCAA for presenting this award to me. I will forever cherish it.

Thank you.

[Note: The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Adams: Dr. Frank, we thank you for those words, for your long-time commitment to the NCAA, to higher education and to all of the things that bring this group together today.

Myles, we want to thank you once again for your remarks, for your presentation, for your commitment to service; and, I want to thank all of you.

It would be easy to avoid this opening session. We have had splendid attendance, and I want to thank each one of you for coming.

We also would remind you, please don’t forget your reception in the Ryman Exhibit Hall immediately after this session.

You will be able to enjoy the Convention’s trade show and to perhaps have some time to visit with your colleagues and friends. You will need to wear your badge and to show your credentials to enter the reception.

We also encourage you to please refer to the Convention schedule for details regarding your individual division business sessions and forums.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are off to a great official start.

Thanks to each one of you for being a part of this record attendance, and thank you for your patience and your participation this afternoon.

This session is now adjourned.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 6 p.m.]

HONORS CELEBRATION

JANUARY 12, 2008

The 43rd NCAA Honors Celebration was called to order at 7 p.m. by Michael Adams, NCAA Executive Committee chair and president of the University of Georgia.

WELCOME

Mr. Adams: Good evening and welcome to the 43rd annual NCAA Honors Celebration.

Tonight, we celebrate NCAA student-athletes, past and present, who have exemplified excellence throughout their careers. Please direct your attention to the video screens for a short video introduction of the 2008 honorees.

“Tonight, from the Gaylord Opryland in Nashville, Tennessee, we present the 43rd annual NCAA Honors Celebration, featuring from Yale University, NCAA Inspiration Award Honoree, Jim MacLaren.

“And the 2008 NCAA Top VIII Award Recipients — from Stanford University, soccer standout, Rachel Buehler; from Georgia Institute of Technology, amateur golfer, Roberto Castro; from the University of Oregon, star quarterback, Dennis Dixon, from the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 2006-07 Honda Broderick Cup winner, Sarah Pavan; from Stanford University, 20-time swimming All-American, Ben Wildman-Tobriner; from Calvin College, basketball and track and field All-American, Lisa Winkle; from Clarion University of Pennsylvania, seven-time diving national champion and eight-time All-American, Jamie Wolf; from Willamette University, two-time cross country national champion and three-time All-American, Sarah Zerzan.

“The 2008 NCAA Award of Valor Honorees — from the United States Military Academy, Purple Heart recipient, Second Lieutenant Emily Perez; from the United States Naval Academy, Medal of Honor recipient, Major Doug Zembiec.

“And the 2008 NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipients — from the University of Florida, two-time Olympic gold medalist, Theresa Andrews; from Pennsylvania State University, ESPN college football lead analyst, Todd Blackledge; from the University of California, Los Angeles, United States district judge, the Honorable Cormac Carney; from Old Dominion University, 2008 USA women’s basketball Olympic team head coach, Anne Donovan; from the University of California, Los Angeles, softball legend, Dot Richardson; from Southeastern Louisiana University, ‘Good Morning America’ anchor, Robin Roberts; our final Silver Anniversary honoree, from Colgate University, ABC News anchor, Bob Woodruff.

“And the distinguished recipient of the 2008 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award, from Muskingum College, NASA astronaut and retired United States senator, the Honorable John Glenn.

“Please welcome the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of the University of Georgia, Dr. Michael Adams.” (Applause)

Mr. Adams: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the NCAA Honors Celebration and the Board it is my distinct pleasure to welcome you to this 43rd annual NCAA Honors Celebration.

Tonight’s program is a celebration of our award recipients and their respective pursuits of excellence and the smallest margins it took for them to attain their wildest dreams as student-athletes and in their chosen careers.

We are honoring current and former NCAA student-athletes whose success as athletes was measured in inches, seconds and desire.

We are recognizing men and women whose service as business leaders, doctors, soldiers, journalists and public servants was measured in extra effort in hard work and sometimes with their own lives.

The NCAA Top VIII are winding down their undergraduate careers, and as you will see later, none of them are phoning it in. They are completing their student-athlete experience with style and grace.

The Silver Anniversary award recipients left campus 25 years ago and have made huge impacts in the pursuits of knowledge, healing, justice and information.

You will be moved by the sacrifice of our two Award of Valor recipients and the amazing determination exhibited by the Inspiration Award honoree.

And finally, this year's Theodore Roosevelt Award recipient was not satisfied with the 30 years-and-a-gold-watch career. Instead, he served in the military as a soldier, brought international attention to the country as an astronaut in the newly created space program and served his country well as a great United States Senator.

For these honorees tonight, excellence is a theme that has been played out throughout their lives.

At this time, help me recognize NCAA president, Dr. Myles Brand, a man whose foresight and leadership continues to guide the NCAA in its dedication to higher education and intercollegiate athletics excellence.

Next, I want you to help me thank the members of the NCAA Honors Committee for their work in selecting tonight's distinguished award recipients. I can tell you that this was not an easy job. I would like to ask the committee members to please stand as I call each name individually, and I ask them to please remain standing until all the names have been called and for you to please hold your applause until each has been recognized.

From the Ohio Athletic Conference, committee chair, Timothy Gleason; from the Atlantic Coast Conference, former commissioner, Gene Corrigan; from Albany State University in Georgia, Stephanie Harrison-Dyer; from Western Carolina University, Gibbs Knotts; from the America East Conference, Julie Ruppert; from Wake Forest University, Barbara Walker. Not able to be with us tonight from the University of California, Los Angeles, Olympian Jackie Joyner-Kersey; from Yale University, former Silver Anniversary winner, Calvin Hill.

Join me in thanking this distinguished committee. (Applause)

We appreciate the work that each of you has done in examining the credentials of many NCAA student-athletes and selecting from those our celebrated honorees.

Ladies and gentlemen, at yesterday's opening business session of the 2008 Convention, NCAA President Dr. Myles Brand presented the Gerald R. Ford Award to former NCAA and Lincoln University (Missouri) president, Dr. James Frank. The Gerald R. Ford Award is presented to a person who has shown significant leadership during his or her career as an advocate for intercollegiate athletics.

Dr. Frank emphasized the pursuit of excellence and worked tirelessly toward equality in sports. He was the Association's first African-American president and also one of the few people who has participated as a student-athlete, continued as a coach, a professor, a college president and a commissioner within the NCAA structure.

Dr. Frank led the NCAA's Long-Range Planning Committee, which resulted in a demographic change in Association leadership. He was a key force in bringing women's championships under the umbrella of the NCAA and was instrumental in forming the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee.

During the NCAA centennial year, Dr. Frank was recognized as one of the NCAA's 100 Most Influential Student-Athletes.

In honor of Dr. Frank, the NCAA will donate an honorarium to the institution of his choice for the benefit of student-athletes.

Ladies and gentlemen, join me in welcoming and congratulating once again, Dr. James Frank. (Applause)

At this time, we will meet the 2008 honorees through video tributes, through question-and-answer sessions and through personal reflections.

As he has done before, guiding us through this look at excellence this evening will be our master of ceremonies for the evening, someone who you know from your TV screens and from your radio, someone who has hosted many similar occasions, and someone who also has been intimately involved with this event not only as a host, but as a former Silver Anniversary award recipient himself.

He has been a member of the Honors Committee, he played football at Yale, and it gives me great pleasure to turn the podium over to the one who will lead us and emcee us through tonight's evening.

Join me, please, in welcoming award-winning broadcaster and great friend of the NCAA, Mr. Jack Ford. (Applause)

Jack Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I am delighted to be your host for this very special event tonight.

In learning about tonight's award winners and their respective pursuits of excellence, we have all been struck by the tiniest of increments there are between success and failure and excellence, and between a challenger and a champion.

Tonight's honorees measured their success by pushing themselves to excel in the classroom and in athletics

venues. Many times, that meant extra work, coming early and staying late, extra repetitions and coaching, and late-night studies. But they were all rewarded as you will see.

For all of our honorees, I am sure the extra drive and determination often translated into times when they were alone, working by themselves with no cheers from the crowd or recognition from a professor. They were motivated by an internal hunger to achieve goals, a personal best, a world record, perhaps even a perfect grade-point average.

What they learned about themselves is immeasurable, whether it was a notion that they could be the best in their field, a dream that they could do something no other human being had ever done or the realization that their quick action meant saving the lives of others. Their pursuit seemed, to them, worth their sacrifice.

Tonight, we will recognize the NCAA Top VIII, eight outstanding student-athletes who have completed their eligibility; and the NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipients, seven distinguished former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of completing their athletics eligibility.

We will present the NCAA Inspiration Award and the Award of Valor to honorees whose stories will move you.

And finally, we will present the NCAA's highest honor — the Theodore Roosevelt Award, an honor that has been bestowed on Presidents George H.W. Bush, Gerald Ford and Dwight Eisenhower, innovators like John Wooden and Paul Tagliabue, world-class athletes like Althea Gibson and Jesse Owens and, similar to tonight's honoree, an astronaut in the United States space program, Sally Ride.

Each recipient will receive an award that has been designed with the NCAA's five founding principles in mind — amateurism, institutional control and responsibility, sound academic standards, governing financial aid, and governing recruiting.

The height of the awards symbolizes infinity, representing the never-ending journey of student-athletes in their commitment to and pursuit of excellence.

Each individual award has distinct differences signifying its unique meaning.

The Top VIII Award includes a blue color scheme, which signifies the closeness of the recipients to the NCAA of today. The Silver Anniversary award is silver, representing the traditional 25-year mark and lifetime contributions made by the recipients. The Inspiration Award includes yellow, symbolizing a beacon of light as inspiration for us all. The Award of Valor is red, white and blue, representing a commitment to patriotism. The Theodore Roosevelt Award is gold and the largest of the awards, standing tall as the NCAA's highest honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we hear the stories of our award recipients, I am sure you will be as amazed as we have been by their unflinching pursuit of excellence.

INSPIRATION AWARD WINNER

The first award to be presented tonight is one that is reserved for special circumstances and incredible people who, when confronted with a life-altering situation, used dogged determination and commitment to overcome an obstacle and in the process serve as a role model to others.

In the face of the unfairness of life, the recipient of the NCAA's Inspiration Award discovered that sometimes the mental capacity and desire to live a meaningful and rewarding life is often stronger than the physical tools with which we are born.

Audiovisual: As a 300-pound defensive end, Yale University student-athlete Jim MacLaren measured his success in terms of quarterback sacks, wins and losses, and grade-point averages.

Years later, as a world-class triathlete, MacLaren marked his progress in terms of time, laps and endurance.

After two tragedies left him without the use of his arms and legs, MacLaren says, something as simple as getting out of bed each day, is sometimes a bigger challenge and of more significance than all his previous achievements.

Shortly after graduating in 1985 with a degree in theatre studies, MacLaren was leaving a New York City theatre rehearsal session when he was hit by a 40,000-pound city bus.

Although he was given virtually no chance to live, he survived. During 18 hours of surgery, doctors were forced to amputate MacLaren's left leg below his knee.

Jim MacLaren: I lifted up my sheet and thought, wow, this is me for the rest of my life. I was a 300-pound rock with arms in those days. I was still in a football player's body. I heard it was good for rehabilitation, so I started swimming. I ended up losing 110 pounds because I started biking to class, first just because the prosthetics in those days weren't made that well, so I would get cut a lot just walking.

What it really became with the swimming and the biking and then the hopping and the skipping and the running was just "let's see what I can do."

Audiovisual: Pulling from the lessons and discipline he learned as a student-athlete, MacLaren put himself through a rigorous rehabilitation program.

As a two-sport athlete at Yale who knew his body and its strengths and limitations, MacLaren was able to re-invent himself into a world-class triathlete.

While participating in the biking leg of a triathlon in California in 1993, MacLaren was struck by a van. His neck was broken and he was paralyzed from his chest down.

Doubting his will to live after a second horrible accident, MacLaren was forced to look deep within himself to find the ultimate answer for survival.

Mr. MacLaren: Bad things happen to good people. Stuff happens. I mean none of this is fair, but so what? I got to get up every morning. I'm above the ground.

I might as well engage life. Life isn't fair. Now let's get busy living.

Audiovisual: For his work through his Choosing Living Foundation and for his courage and determination in the face of tremendous adversity, MacLaren was awarded the 2005 ESPY Arthur Ashe Courage Award.

Mr. MacLaren: We are helping everyone from CEOs with addiction problems to a kindergartner who might need an artificial leg. And I am able finally to help the world.

Scott Hibbs: Wow, Jim is such an amazing person. He wants people to realize that they, too, are an amazing person.

Audiovisual: With a strong sense of gratefulness and a new roller by which to gauge his success, Jim MacLaren has taught people around the world how to measure the fullness of their life.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, as a former Yale football player, I am especially proud to introduce from Yale University the 2008 Inspiration Award honoree, Jim MacLaren. (Applause)

Presenting Jim's award tonight is Jim Ford, senior associate athletics director at Yale University.

[Note: The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE — JIM MacLAREN

Mr. MacLaren: I was just saying to one of the volunteers, Jean, backstage, I am a keynote speaker and yet I always get nervous about what I am going to say.

So I will start with just thank you. You know, friends will often ask me, why do you think you had two accidents?

I quickly come back with the answer that maybe I finally needed to just sit down. (Laughter)

In many ways, I mean that, because Dr. Adams, I caught a word that you said.

The word was "reflection."

That is something that I am blessed with, the ability to reflect upon my experiences in life, and not just in the past, but of the current ones.

I am blessed with that ability to reflect along with getting all my sensation back and having chronic pain and getting bladder infections about 20 times a year.

But reflection is by far one of the greatest gifts that I received, and something that I think in this fast-paced world that we don't think we have the time to do.

As we look back and we think about the Silver Anniversary Award winners, is the experience that we learned a lot about when we look back upon our NCAA days, or is it in the reflections where we actually experienced the experience?

I believe now that I am a happier human being than I was, a fuller human being than I ever would have been had these two accidents not happened to me and they, truly, have been gifts and not tragedies.

Inspiration. You know, I love words, and when I thought about the word inspiration and started looking at it, and I started to look at the logical root of the word. It is really to breathe in spirit, faith, the human spirit and soul, to take it in.

So, when people ask me, "Jim, how do you feel about being an inspiration?" I say, "I don't know how that feels

because I don't think of myself as an inspiration, but I allowed myself to be inspired by others."

That is the point I guess I feel the most about this evening is that inspiration is not just something that is special to the few of us who get up on this wonderful stage this evening.

Inspiration is here. All we have to do is allow ourselves to breathe it in.

That is one thing that each and every one of us in this room shares, a human spirit and the ability to be inspired every single day.

Lastly, I would like to thank Jim for putting my name out here with all these amazing people and share the greatest definition of success that I have ever heard: Do you live and are you loved?

Now, that is success.

I want to thank all of you and all of the other honorees because I am inspired by everyone here and by everyone I have been lucky enough to meet.

Thank you so much to the NCAA, and God bless all of you.

Thank you. (Applause)

TOP VIII AWARD HONOREES

Mr. Ford: You may not think of him as an inspiration, but all of us who have ever come in contact with Jim MacLaren love him for the inspiration he has provided for all of us.

Our next group of honorees has recently completed their eligibility as student-athletes, concluding stellar careers both in the classroom and in athletics competition.

They include NCAA champions, United States national team participants and a Heisman Trophy candidate. They also include future doctors, engineers and at least one current school teacher.

At this time, let's introduce you to the 2008 NCAA Top VIII Award recipients.

You will find our first Top VIII honoree anchoring a defense known for shutting down opponents. She is just as tenacious in the science lab, looking for a shutout against various medical diseases.

Rachel Buehler, Stanford University

Audiovisual: America's next great medical breakthrough will be a byproduct of hours of research in university labs across the country and could likely involve someone like Stanford soccer standout Rachel Buehler.

As a human biology major with an emphasis in premed, Buehler has carved out a better-than-perfect 4.022 grade point average.

Rachel Buehler: I shadowed a couple of orthopedic surgeons who actually did my ACL surgery, so I had a personal connection with them, which was really great. Observing them and watching them interact with their patients, really made me want to be a doctor.

Audiovisual: Buehler has also found time to be a lab research assistant in the cardiovascular medicine division at Stanford. She has investigated the association between obesity, insulin and glucose levels.

As a three-time team captain for a nationally ranked team, Buehler entered her senior year as a Hermann Trophy candidate, recognizing the best collegiate player in the nation. She led the Cardinal to four NCAA tournament appearances during her career.

She anchored a defense that recorded nine shutouts and allowed only 0.74 goals per game for the season.

She has extensive national team experience, representing the United States in three Nordic Cup soccer tournaments and leading the team to a gold medal as its captain in the 2007 tourney in Finland.

As a member of the Stanford community, Buehler donated her time to many worthy causes, including programs to benefit Alzheimer's patients.

Ms. Buehler: My favorite volunteer activity was feeding Alzheimer's patients. It was a very rewarding experience for me. We don't usually think about eating, it's such a basic thing for all of us, but it's a necessity to live, and feeding these patients allowed them to survive longer and allowed them to be healthier.

Audiovisual: Constantly questioning, diligently observing and always searching, Stanford's Rachel Buehler will certainly help find the answers to any of our most important medical questions.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Stanford University, Rachel Buehler.

Presenting Rachel's award is Paul Ratcliffe, head women's soccer coach at Stanford University. (Applause)

Roberto Castro, Georgia Institute of Technology

Mr. Ford: On what are viewed as some of the most serene settings in sports, the next Top VIII honoree continually passed the test of nerves that comes with playing amateur golf.

Audiovisual: Golf is one of those sports where as the pressure mounts, the crowds get quieter and quieter and the silence becomes almost deafening. No one knows this feeling better than Georgia Tech's Roberto Castro, who went straight from the frying pan into the fire earlier this year.

After finishing his career as one of Georgia Tech's most outstanding golfers, Castro immediately went back to school — Q school — a three-stage tournament that determines if players will compete on the upcoming PGA Tour.

Roberto Castro: Different than most sports, in golf you kind of have only one year to kind of jump up to the next level. And, it's pressure but that's kind of why I chose to play golf from day one.

Audiovisual: Although playing what he considered some of his best golf, Castro's bid for a spot on the PGA Tour came up short, but it did nothing to diminish his stellar intercollegiate career.

After his senior campaign at Georgia Tech, Castro was named a co-recipient of the Byron Nelson Award, given annually to the outstanding senior golfer. He was a four-time All-American and a four-time all-conference performer. He finished third at the NCAA Golf Championships in 2005 and helped Georgia Tech capture ACC championship titles in 2006 and 2007.

Castro picked up his first tournament win in 2007 during the Puerto Rico Classic.

Mr. Castro: I think a lot of what you do is determined by your environment. I was fortunate to be in a very positive one.

Audiovisual: Castro experienced amateur competition on an international level when he participated on Palmer Cup teams in 2005 and 2006.

Castro graduated with highest honors and a degree in industrial engineering. He was a two-time CoSIDA first-team academic All-American and a four-time academic all-ACC selection.

His extracurricular activities included participating on Georgia Tech's Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, volunteering for Special Olympics events and Habitat for Humanity.

Bruce Heppler: To combine what he achieved in golf with what he achieved in academics, I am not sure there are many people who could do that and I think his greatest asset is his efficiency.

Audiovisual: In a sport that exposes every tiny weakness in its participants, Roberto Castro's steely determination and unwavering confidence have helped him compete at the highest level of his game.

Mr. Ford: From Georgia Institute of Technology, Roberto Castro. (Applause)

Presenting Roberto's award is Bruce Heppler, head men's golf coach at the Georgia Institute of Technology. (Applause)

Dennis Dixon, University of Oregon

Mr. Ford: Our next Top VIII honoree suffered an injury, but maintained a healthy perspective on college football and his academic career.

Audiovisual: With 11 players on both sides of the ball, it's easier to believe that the absence of one playmaker couldn't possibly make that much of a difference.

However, when that playmaker is Dennis Dixon, the difference was clear.

Through nine games, Dixon led the Ducks to an 8-1 record and a school-best No. 2 national ranking. He completed 172 of 254 passes for 2,136 yards and 24 touchdowns. He ran for 583 yards and nine more touchdowns.

His stats and performance week in and week out were worthy of Heisman Trophy mention after every game — until a knee injury during Oregon's game against Arizona ended Dixon's season.

Despite the disappointment of not being able to finish his senior campaign, Dixon was his team's biggest cheerleader.

Dixon's impressive season did not go unrecognized. He was voted the Pacific-10 Conference offensive play-

er of the year. He was a finalist for every major player-of-the-year award and quarterback-of-the-year award.

Dennis Dixon: Having that determination in everything I do and doing it 110 percent helped me through my whole college career.

Audiovisual: Dixon's performance in the classroom was also not without recognition.

The sociology major has recorded better than a 3.0 grade point average through 11 terms and he was a first-team CoSIDA academic all-district first team member and finalist for the CoSIDA academic All-American of the year.

Mr. Dixon: Without the education, sports won't follow. My mindset was to get things done, to graduate early, take full pride in my education, and then once that is handled, the big things will follow.

Audiovisual: Dixon was part of a weekly speaking team at Oregon that addressed middle school assemblies to promote sportsmanship, academic success and sports participation.

A two-sport athlete, Dixon spent the summer of 2007 in the Atlanta Braves farm system.

While injuries are part of collegiate sports participation, Dennis Dixon put a positive face on his very public injury and reminded college football fans that there was more to his career as a student-athlete than just wins and losses.

Mr. Ford: From the University of Oregon, Dennis Dixon. (Applause)

Dennis' award is being presented by Pat Kilkenney, director of athletics at the University of Oregon. (Applause)

Sarah Pavan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Mr. Ford: A naturally driven student and athlete, this Top VIII performer arrived in America's heartland from her native Canada to leave her mark on an already storied volleyball program.

Audiovisual: When Sarah Pavan left Ontario to play volleyball at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, she brought with her one of the most outstanding reputations the sport has ever known.

Coached her whole career by her father, and following in the footsteps of her mother who played on Canada's national team, Pavan, at six-feet, five-inches, was fundamentally sound and highly skilled.

She proceeded to lead Nebraska to its third NCAA volleyball championship and ended her career as one of the Huskers' most decorated players, arguably the best to ever play at Nebraska.

After leading the Huskers to the NCAA Division I national championship as a junior, Pavan was named the American Volleyball Coaches Association national player of the year in 2006.

Husker fans, crazy about their volleyball teams, would come to know a young woman who was able to block out all distractions in her pursuit of perfection, both on the court and in the classroom.

Sarah Pavan: Volleyball and my academics are the main things in my life right now. I have been really disciplined with practice and school and getting everything done while traveling.

Audiovisual: Pavan ended her career as Nebraska's all-time leader in kills. She was a four-time AVCA All-American and was voted the most outstanding player of the 2006 NCAA championship. She was the Big 12 female athlete of the year and the Big 12's two-time volleyball player of the year.

A biochemistry major, Pavan has maintained a perfect 4.0 grade point average. She won the 2006-07 Honda Broderick Cup, which is awarded to the top female student-athlete in the country.

In addition to her work as a student-athlete, Pavan participated in many volunteer activities. She was a featured speaker for more than 2,000 eighth-graders in the Lincoln Public School System and lectured about staying in school, getting good grades and making good decisions.

Focused, serious and always prepared, Pavan proved the measure of her talent and worth every day while earning accolades on the court and in the classroom.

Mr. Ford: From the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Sarah Pavan. (Applause)

Presenting Sarah's award tonight is Harvey Perlman, chancellor at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (Applause)

Ben Wildman-Tobriner, Stanford University

Mr. Ford: In the pool, our next Top VIII honoree measures his performance not only against our country's best swimmers but also the world's best swimmers.

In the classroom, he comes out on top every time.

Audiovisual: In a sport where the thinnest of margins separate excellence from error, Stanford University swimmer Ben Wildman-Tobriner strives to go faster and faster.

Wildman-Tobriner was an NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner after posting a 3.73 grade point average in biomechanical engineering at Stanford.

Ben Wildman-Tobriner: Sacrifice, hard work, and time management, are three areas that all NCAA student-athletes are required to master.

Audiovisual: He was ESPN The Magazine's academic All-American of the year for the university division in 2007 and was the winner of the Stanford athletics board's highest honor, the Al Master's Award.

He earned 20 All-American honors in the pool, setting the American record in the 50-yard freestyle during the 2007 NCAA championships. He set school records in the 50- and 100-yard freestyle events and the 100-yard butterfly. As the 2007 Pacific-10 swimmer of the year, he captured individual and four relay conference titles.

He has competed extensively for the United States in world swimming competitions, including the Pan Pacific Championships, the Olympic Trials and the World Championships.

Most recently, he captured two gold medals at the 2007 FINA World Championships. On the heels of that performance, he received the USA Swimming Breakout Performer of the Year award.

Mr. Wildman-Tobriner: There definitely have been times in my athletics career where I have gotten best times or I have done things that I thought were my best, but I am still swimming now, and I hope that my real personal best is yet to come.

Audiovisual: Out of the pool, Wildman-Tobriner also volunteered for the local Boys and Girls Club and as a public speaker for new student orientation at Stanford.

With his best swims still ahead of him and his professional career practically limitless, Ben Wildman-Tobriner will no doubt routinely find himself in the top spot of the medal stand.

Mr. Ford: From Stanford University, Ben Wildman-Tobriner. (Applause)

Presenting Ben's award is Skip Kenney, head men's swimming coach at Stanford University. (Applause)

Lisa Winkle, Calvin College

Mr. Ford: As a two-sport standout in basketball and track and field, our next Top VIII honoree graduated from college only to find herself once again roaming the halls in high school; however, this time she returned in pursuit of excellence as a math teacher at her alma mater.

Audiovisual: When her father suffered a stroke, Lisa Winkle looked to her Calvin College teammates for solace and counted her blessings for their support.

Calvin has been counting its blessings the last four years as Winkle has demonstrated excellence in the classroom and as a two-sport standout.

Lisa Winkle: I was always very fortunate to have coaches and teammates who stressed the importance of academics.

Audiovisual: Winkle carried a 3.97 grade point average in mathematics and secondary education. In 2006, the Detroit Athletic Club designated Winkle the Michigan Female College Athlete of the Year.

She was an NCAA Woman of the Year candidate in October 2007 and was a three-time ESPN The Magazine academic All-American. Four times she was named a U.S. Track and Cross Country Coaches Association academic All-American.

On the basketball court, Winkle finished her career as the school's all-time leading scorer and rebounder.

She won the 2007 Josten's Player of the Year trophy and was a first-team All-American. She led Calvin to three NCAA tournaments, including two quarterfinal appearances.

As a jumper and sprinter on the outdoor track team, the measure of Winkle's success changed from points and rebounds to time and distance. She was a 10-time All-American and led her team to three second-place fin-

ishes at the NCAA Division III outdoor championships.

She won 12 conference titles in the long jump, the sprints and as part of two relay teams.

Ms. Winkle: It's the big picture of working as a teammate, supporting other teammates, not just about a personal high score.

Audiovisual: Her extracurricular activities included tutoring single mothers, coaching and officiating middle school boy's basketball and serving as a fifth-grade Sunday school teacher.

Upon returning to her high school alma mater as a teacher after a stellar college career, Lisa Winkle has proven she will always be true to her school.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Calvin College, Lisa Winkle. (Applause)

Presenting the award is Dr. Nancy L. Meyer, women's athletics director at Calvin College. (Applause)

Jamie Wolf, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Mr. Ford: The next Top VIII honoree says constructive criticism and feedback have always been important components in making her a better student and athlete, as early as her youth when her mom was her soccer coach right up until today, as she pursues a doctorate in molecular genetics.

Audiovisual: If a high grade point average were the only indicator of a successful college career, Jamie Wolf could already acclaim her sport at the top.

Jamie Wolf: My parents always taught me to work as hard as I could. And that no matter how hard I worked, that I would always succeed because success wasn't always winning.

So, really, that mentality carried all the way through my collegiate career.

Audiovisual: As a student at Clarion University, Wolf maintained a perfect 4.0 GPA in molecular biology. She was an NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner and ESPN The Magazine recognized her as its academic All-American of the year for the college division in 2007.

Last October, she was a finalist for the NCAA Woman of the Year.

During her career as an athlete at Clarion, Wolf was almost beyond measure in her success. She won seven of eight possible NCAA one- and three-meter diving championships, shattering the previous record of four individual titles.

She also set an NCAA record for most points scored in the one-meter competition. An eight-time All-American, Wolf was the NCAA Division II female diver of the year three times.

Ms. Wolf: I felt amazing my senior year. I really felt good on the boards. I felt like everything came together.

Audiovisual: Her extracurricular activities included leadership positions in several campus organizations.

In her spare time, Wolf helped organize canned food drives and participated in her community's operation clean sweep program.

She has been accepted to Ohio State University, where she will study molecular genetics for her doctorate.

By any measure, Jamie Wolf has more than exceeded the standards of excellence she has set for herself.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Jamie Wolf. (Applause)

Presenting Jamie's award is Dr. Joseph Grunenwald, president of Clarion University of Pennsylvania. (Applause)

Sarah Zerzan, Willamette University

Mr. Ford: Family ties are important to our final Top VIII honoree. When choosing a college, she followed in the footsteps of many of her relatives. While running the cross country course, she did so in memory of her mother.

Audiovisual: Her grandparents met and married while students at Willamette University in Oregon. Her father, Terry, an aerospace engineer, was a standout runner and school record holder. Her mother, Lisa, who passed away in 1990, spoke seven languages and traveled the world. Cross country standout Sarah Zerzan took the best of both worlds with her to Willamette and has set a course for herself to make a difference in the world.

Sarah Zerzan: I will always be grateful to my mother. She gave me the gift of life, and that's the greatest gift that you can give someone.

I strive to be the type of person who would make her proud and represent her memory well.

Audiovisual: As a member of the cross country team, Zerzan concluded her career with two NCAA Division III cross country individual championships, three West Region championships and two Northwest Conference titles.

Her team won conference championships each of the four years she ran.

A three-time All-American and ESPN academic All-American, Zerzan is the school record holder in the 5,000 and 6,000 meters for cross country and established school records in the 1,500-, 5,000- and 10,000-meter events in track.

While her accomplishments in running are unmatched, her success is even more amazing considering that during her sophomore year in college, she was hit by a car as she crossed the street.

Ms. Zerzan: I was really lucky that it just took me out for a few months. And it gave me this new perspective on running and just on life in general, just to be grateful for what I have. I think that helped me to excel more afterwards.

Audiovisual: With her sights on a medical degree. Zerzan has maintained a 3.9 grade point average and will put her biochemistry degree to good use as a pediatrician.

Zerzan was one of four students at Willamette who founded a student global AIDS campaign chapter on campus.

Running for herself, fully dedicated to helping others, Sarah Zerzan has in no small measure strengthened her family tree and made both her parents extremely proud.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Willamette University, Sarah Zerzan.

Presenting Sarah's award is Lee Pelton, president at Willamette University. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Welcome and congratulations on your selection as 2008 NCAA Top VIII Award honorees.

During this portion of our program, we have a chance to chat with you a little bit and give all the folks here an opportunity to learn a little bit more about all of you.

We have been obviously impressed by what we have seen so far. It is oftentimes important, especially for the young people out there, to listen to some of the other messages that you have to say.

Jamie, let me start with you. We heard you say that success isn't always about winning. I suspect that people, especially those who have seen how successful you have been as a student-athlete, might find that surprising.

What did you mean by that?

Jamie Wolf: It is not whether you win, it is whether you just try your best all the time.

I know from my experience if you don't try your best, you always look back on it and think, "oh, I should have or could have" if you didn't win, or even if you took second, it is like if you didn't try your best, what could you have done?

If you go 115 percent all the time, then you can never look back and regret anything whether you win or whether you lose.

Mr. Ford: We have seen the various successes that you have all achieved, but we have seen that each of you has had some roadblocks involving injuries.

Dennis, for a good portion of this season, people were saying Oregon's magnificent team, Dennis Dixon, Heisman Trophy candidate, and the pinnacle of this year for you was getting knocked out with an injury.

I am sure there are a lot of young people who would like to know what did you then do? What did you think? How did you stay connected to your team realizing that before you were their leader and the best you can be is a cheerleader?

Dennis Dixon: From the get-go, the team nominated me as senior captain, and by being on the field, it made me the best I could be to reach for my goal.

When I was injured, I reflected back on our previous quarterback, Kellen Clemens, who is now with the Jets.

He had an injury at the same time and the same place in Arizona. It is difficult out there, so the next time you go to Arizona, you may want to be careful.

Mr. Ford: It's going to get harder getting anybody to play quarterback.

Mr. Dixon: Yes. He gave so much inspiration to me, because it was pretty much my first time going out there. He gave me so much courage.

I just thought that I am in the same situation. I should return the favor.

We have so many young quarterbacks at the University of Oregon that have the courage and confidence to go out there and do the best they can.

It is my goal for that to happen.

Mr. Ford: Sarah, you had an injury also. We heard that kept you down for three months.

Did you learn things from not participating in programs in some ways that you would not have learned if you had continued on with your career?

Sarah Pavan: Definitely. I was injured the week before the conference championships, so I had to stay on the sidelines and help run the computers.

Actually, it was rewarding. I would have been totally focused on my own race and being taken out of it made me look at the team effort and look at what my entire team was doing. It made me refocus everything I was doing and made me realize that I was only part of a bigger picture.

Mr. Ford: In terms of a bigger picture, we have seen a couple of you are interested in medicine as a career.

I know, Rachel, you have talked about that also. What do you think you can bring to a medicine career from your experience as a student-athlete?

Rachel Buehler: As a student-athlete, you experience a lot of different stresses, and being a doctor is a very stressful situation.

You have the person's life in your hands. You learn in your sport how to deal with stress and to be passionate about what you do.

All of us have given great passion to our sports and academics, and as a doctor I think that is what it is all about — giving passion to your patients.

You just have that in you.

Mr. Ford: So much of your success as a student-athlete has to do with how you handle the stress that Rachel mentioned.

Roberto, you are sort of unique in this group of student-athletes in the sense that most of them are involved with surges of adrenaline and activity, and you are lining up a putt while they are doing that.

Let's talk about the stress of your sport and how that will help you in whatever you choose to do.

Roberto Castro: It is definitely a different situation than most, because in golf you are playing against yourself the entire time.

I think all of us know that life is not so much what happens to us, it is how you deal with it. That is how golf is also.

I have gotten better, and I hope I will get better in dealing with what comes my way and keeping everything in front of me.

But school teaches you that. A lot of things happen to you in the four years you couldn't have predicted, and I was never hit by a car, but other things happened.

You just have to roll with the punches and get ready for it.

Mr. Ford: When you talk about handling things, Sarah, you came down from Canada with an enormous reputation and came to one of the top programs in the country, but you came with that burden of expectation.

How did you handle that?

Sarah Pavan: Nebraska is like an institution. There is not much going on in the state, and volleyball is a focus, not just like the college, but the entire population. So, it is difficult when there are so many demands placed upon your time to be an active member in the community and make appearances.

The important thing that I realized was to remember why I came to Nebraska, which was to get an education. Focusing on that helps me get through all the pressures that I had to deal with volleyball-wise.

In Nebraska, volleyball is going to happen. It is guaranteed. It is just such a big thing. The school is what you make of it yourself. I think the good balance that I was able to create for me academically definitely helped alleviate the pressure.

Mr. Ford: We saw in your piece a little bit earlier that you talked about sacrifice, hard work, and the time

management that is essential to young athletes. Many say it is like a job. How do you all do that but still manage to be a college kid?

Mr. Castro: You have to make sure that you are still a college kid, and one of the things I try to focus on no matter what I am doing is having fun, and really that is what everybody will agree is number five. If we are not having fun, we probably won't want to do it as well.

So making sure you enjoy what you are doing is very critical. I think academically, that means that we were interested academically in trying 115 percent and making sure you are having fun with your teammates.

Mr. Ford: Lisa, we see where you are in your life and those of us who have taken literature courses, we talk about the author who can't go home again.

You have shown that you can go home again. Why was it important for you to go back to the high school where you began and contribute as a teacher?

Lisa Winkle: I had a lot of great role models who just really helped push me along both athletically and academically. I know a lot of times I didn't have as many female/male role models in the field I was interested in.

As a teacher now, especially as a math teacher, I like to be a role model for my female students as well as the male students, and show them that females can be good at math and succeed athletically, and they can still be girly while they are doing that.

Mr. Ford: Does it feel strange to you to be walking the halls when not that long ago you were there?

Ms. Winkle: Yes, it is hard walking through the hall and calling my former teachers by their first name. After a month or so, you just say okay, I have to call you Pete instead of Mr. Dickenmeir. He is good with that.

Mr. Ford: We have just a few minutes left up here. I am curious to wrap up the thoughts here. Whether you like it or not, you were role models. I think you all have embraced that notion here. I am sure there will be a lot of potential student-athletes who are going to watch this and listen to all of your stories.

If you could give a message to any of them out there about your careers, your successes, your expectations in life and their expectations, what would you tell them, Rachel?

Rachel Buehler: To enjoy what you are doing and make the most of it, and do things because you love it, not because you feel like you have to. Also, give 115 percent.

Mr. Ford: Dennis, how about your success, injury, looking to the future, what would you say to young people about how you handled those types of obstacles?

Dennis Dixon: He said it best, you have a learning process, just seize the moment while you are in it. Don't regret anything that you do. I don't regret anything. Just seize the moment.

Mr. Ford: It has been a pleasure to meet all of you. I have been delighted to spend time with you. We are astonished by your successes. We certainly offer to all of you our congratulations. We can expect that 25 years from now that perhaps we will see you back here as Silver Anniversary awardees.

Congratulations to all of you.

AWARD OF VALOR

Ladies and gentlemen, our next award is the Award of Valor, which is presented to a current or former NCAA student-athlete in recognition of courageous action or bravery in situations involving personal danger or disaster.

Tonight, we honor two individuals, both graduates of our country's military academies. They excelled as student-athletes, but were more esteemed for their leadership capabilities.

One was serving her first tour of duty in Iraq, newly graduated and eager to serve. The other was on his fourth tour of duty, having served in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq.

Both showed true bravery and were shining lights to the soldiers they led.

Our first Award of Valor recipient spent her young life searching for good works to do, excelling at challenges that came her way and leading by the example of her service and spirit.

Emily Perez, U.S. Military Academy

Audiovisual: As a student-athlete at the United States Military Academy and then as an officer in Iraq, Second

Lieutenant Emily Perez had two nicknames. Her superintendent called her “the complete package” because Perez could do everything.

The soldiers stationed with her in Iraq called her “Kobe” because, similar to the basketball star, if something needed to be done, she was the one called upon to do it.

As a cadet at West Point, Perez threw herself into every task. She was the first female minority to be a Cadet Command Sergeant Major in the history of the academy, and she held all four Sergeant Major positions. She sang in the gospel choir, tutored football players and ran track.

Perez’s go-getter attitude extended to her participation as a member of Army’s track and field team, too.

Perez’s most telling athletics accomplishments came during her senior year at the Patriot League Conference meet. She was a member of the first-place 4 x 100 meter relay team. She finished third in the 100-meter dash and sixth in the 200-meter event. However, in a move to guarantee scoring more points than rival Navy, Perez’s coach asked her to compete in the triple jump, an event she had never attempted. Perez finished second.

Vicki Perez: She was needed here. She was needed there. Then, she would go wherever she was needed.

Audiovisual: After graduating in the top 10 of her class with a 3.6 GPA and a bachelor’s degree in sociology, Perez was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the 204th support battalion, second brigade, fourth infantry division of the United States Army.

She was a medical service corps officer and was deployed to Iraq in just a short time. The soldiers under Perez’s command grew so attached to their leader that they often asked her to go on missions to which she was not assigned, just because they felt safer with her in charge.

In September of 2006, just nine months after arriving in Iraq, Perez was on patrol when an improvised explosive device exploded near her vehicle and she was killed.

Devastated, the soldiers in her unit honored Perez by renaming the medical facility in which she worked the Emily Perez Treatment Facility.

Perez, the first female graduate of the U.S. Military Academy to die in Iraq, received numerous decorations for her service and bravery, including the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star Medal.

Daniel Perez: We always taught her you can be and do whatever you want to do, she took that and pushed that to everyone else. She said: “Look at me. If I can rise, you can rise as well, just like I did. All you have to do is apply yourself.”

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Daniel Perez, who will accept the NCAA Award of Valor on behalf of his daughter, Second Lieutenant Emily Perez, and speak for the Perez family.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Presenting the Award of Valor to Mr. Perez in honor of Emily is Kevin Anderson, director of athletics at the U.S. Military Academy. (Applause)

RESPONSE—DANIEL PEREZ

Mr. Perez: Good evening, everyone.

It is a great honor to stand before you today as an ambassador to the legacy of Emily Perez.

I would like to thank God, first of all, and the Honors Committee for this award, the NCAA for having us along with the personnel from West Point to share in this experience with us, and my wife, my family and my friends joining us this evening.

Most importantly, I would like to thank Emily for being who she is and living her life the way she did.

During Emily’s freshman year at Heidelberg High School, located in Heidelberg, Germany, Emily played on the high school junior basketball team. It was evident that basketball was not one of her master activities, but she was a tenacious defender. She needed to develop her offensive skills.

One thing we did notice about Emily was that she was very, very fast. So, we were finally able to convince her to try out for the track team.

Emily started her track career as a member of the Heidelberg varsity track team, and she won a silver medal in the 100-meter dash and a bronze medal as the first leg of a 4 x 100 meter relay team at the 1997 European finals.

While at West Point, she was a very active member of the gospel choir, the office of Christian Fellowship and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and students taking academic responsibility and succeeding in the Stars, the corps' track team and many other organizations.

She proudly served in leadership roles that ranged from squad leader to battalion sergeant major, the regimental sergeant major, and finally the first woman of color to serve as sergeant major of maintenance of the 2005 school year.

West Point is a very demanding and academic institution. They train our military leaders of the future. Through all her trials and tribulations and rigors of doing all you can do to being successful at West Point, Emily still found time to help her fellow cadets.

While serving as command major of the cadets, she received from one of her cadets the following e-mail. It read: "Sergeant Major Emily Perez, I just want to let you know that your testimonial this morning really moved me. I have been struggling a lot the last few weeks academically, personally and spiritually. I try not to let my emotions show, because everyone around me thinks of me as a high-spirited person. But I am going through a lot at this time.

"I know you can remember some of the trials they put you through, especially during that first semester, trying to get your work done, maintaining some kind of social life and dealing with roommates that I don't always see eye-to-eye with, trying to find some kind of study habit or environment, and just planning and thinking how easy life was last year have all been issues I have been struggling with.

"Coming up in the church and having a strong spiritual background were some of the things that really have kept me sane, but sometimes I feel I don't have what it takes to make it through this place, or maybe I am not structured enough to make it through four years of West Point experience.

"I want to let you know that I think God used you as a vessel in my life today. I tend to stray, and I get down on myself during the week, but whenever I leave my family, the gospel choir, from practice or church, I feel uplifted and ready to make it through another week.

"I was just e-mailing you because it was in my heart to let you know what you did for me today. Your testimony definitely proved to me what I really did know all along — through God all things are possible.

"God has a way of reminding us of that when we forget. Thank you for taking a few minutes to give now."

Instead of telling the young soldier to get himself together, she had wisdom that surpassed her young years.

She replied: "Thank you for that, for it was a blessing for me to know you. Always remember He will never put more on you than you can bear.

"In John 16:33, Jesus said, 'These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world you should have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

"Remember that no matter what, God has your back and he has a plan for you that no man can take away. His will will be done whether we want it to be or not, because He is in control.

"So don't put your trust in man, trust only in God. As long as you lean on Him, He will allow everything to fall into place for you. He will provide things for you that you have not even thought of yet.

"He will put you in a position to be a blessing to others. The devil will bring you back down. He is not going to mess with those already doing wrong because he has got them. He is trying to get the Christians like Job. We can't bring anyone else with us if he has us to fall down.

"Always remember that God is above all and He will still keep you as long as you stay true to Him.

"My mom always told me when I was little to do your best and God will do the rest.

"I tell you this now, just keep trying, keep running and God will make sure you are taken care of. We can do all these things through Christ, but we can't do it alone.

"Read the scripture of First Corinthians 2:9.

"If you ever need anything, don't hesitate to get to me."

While at West Point as a member of the track and field team, Emily participated in numerous events, the most memorable being one that she participated in on a trip. Each track and field participant scored early points for the team until the 100 meters announced at the end of the event, and so as not to allow her team the opportunity to miss out possibly earning points, the excitement on her face told it all when she came in second place, earn-

ing points for the team that otherwise would not have been awarded.

But today, as I stand before you, I would not tell you about the atrocities of war nor would I debate with you on the policies of war. Emily saw many things in Iraq at such a tender young age and experienced things that in a way she should never have seen. She was only 23.

Things have been done trying to determine the impact war itself has on the human mind and spirit. I do not believe anyone can understand the things you go through unless they have been there themselves.

There are many things about Emily, but today I come to share some of the things that the media did not tell us.

In May 2005, she graduated in the top 10 percent of her class. She was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Army as a medical service officer by Lieutenant General Bill Lennox.

Shortly after successfully completing her officer's basic course in August 2005 in San Antonio, Texas, and reporting for duty at the fourth infantry division at Fort Hood, Texas, Emily was notified she was a match as a donor for a bone marrow program.

Approximately three weeks before going to Iraq, she traveled to Washington, D.C., and successfully went through the bone marrow process in an effort to save a life.

Although it was a short life, Emily's accomplishments were many. She never wanted them highlighted or exposed.

Her greatest accomplishment was living every minute of her life serving and taking care of others and loving it.

She had a desire to help anyone in need. Her passion was helping people and that passion and willingness to help became synonymous with her name.

She was not only a soldier in the United States Army, but she was also a soldier of God. It was through her undying waver and belief in God that allowed her to persevere in accomplishing the things she did.

It was her faith that would not allow her to accept the opposite. It was her faith that would not allow her to accept man's conception of where a woman stood. It was through her faith and belief that there was nothing too big that God could not handle.

Emily tackled everything that she set her mind to. There was no goal too lofty that would discourage her or allow her to accept defeat.

It was Emily's faith that allowed her to go to Iraq and serve as platoon leader leading convoys, knowing that her first responsibility was to ensure that her soldiers made it back to the base safely.

Emily was the one who led from the front. There was nothing that she would ask of her soldiers that she was not willing to do alongside of them. It was this attitude and faith that helped her welcome the responsibility knowing that her God would never leave her or forsake her.

Was it a tragedy? Yes, it was. When you look at the life that she has led and the accomplishments and the accolades that followed, you can only look back over her life and keep the good memories of the times shared as company.

Emily's character and love and concern for others tagged her as one everyone wanted to ride with while deployed in Iraq. Her soldiers' company, when asked about Emily responded with an analogy.

They said Phil Jackson coaches the Los Angeles Lakers. Whenever they were in a crunch and needed someone to take charge and lead the team to victory, you called on Kobe Bryant. They told her you would get the ball to Kobe, and they told her she was their Kobe.

One of her soldiers wrote: "I was her soldier and my Lieutenant Perez was my platoon leader and she was great. I was her gunner. She was our angel. I would ride with her anywhere. She led from the front. That is the only way she knew how to live.

"I miss you more than you will ever know."

One lady from Washington, D.C., wrote: "Like others before, I think I know Lieutenant Perez, but I will forever hold her with open arms along with some of our past fallen heroes, like the great Dr. Martin Luther King, not to mention Rosa Parks and so many others who have come before her.

"When speaking of the great African-Americans who have paved the way for the future generations, I can

now add Second Lieutenant Emily Perez to the list.

“What an honor it will be.

“I will teach my young daughter just how brave Lieutenant Perez was. I am but three years older than Lieutenant Perez, and you could not imagine having the bravery of a young, beautiful woman like herself possessed.”

It is these things that stand before us. When you look over her life, you can sit back in awe and wonder why. The one thing that Emily always said is that she looked to God one day and she said: “Why is it that I get all these challenging things, and why is it You put me in the positions that You do?”

God answered back to her and said: “Because I want you to be the one who, when others look upon you, they can see that if I did it for you I will do it for them.”

This is my daughter. I share her with you.

Thanks. (Applause)

Doug Zembiec, U.S. Naval Academy

Mr. Ford: Often described as a warrior, this Award of Valor winner used wrestling as a way to mentally prepare himself for the challenges of battle.

Audiovisual: As the toughest guy in the house, Major Doug Zembiec was not satisfied with serving one tour of duty for his country in Kosovo. He left a desk job at the Pentagon to volunteer for duty twice in Afghanistan and finally in Iraq.

As a commander who witnessed death, he was not afraid to show his emotions in front of his men.

Pam Zembiec: I would not call Douglas ordinary — he was extraordinary.

He was just completely selfless all the time. Everything was about everybody else and never about him.

It was about our country, our freedom.

He was the most selfless person I have ever met in my life.

Audiovisual: Zembiec used his early training as a wrestler at the United States Naval Academy to prepare himself for the battles he knew he would be part of upon graduation.

To him, the wrestling mat was a battlefield.

Brian Antonelli: You know, wrestling is a one-on-one sport, a warrior sport, that’s why Doug thrived in that environment.

If it ever got close to conditioning being a factor or mental toughness being a factor, it was in Doug’s hands.

Audiovisual: Zembiec graduated with a degree in political science from the Naval Academy in 1995 as a two-time All-American, competing mostly in the 177-pound weight class.

Always the warrior, Zembiec never hesitated to put himself in danger if it meant helping his troops during battle, sentiments expressed by Zembiec himself as he wrote in his journal.

Ms. Zembiec: I love the feeling of an upcoming challenge — the unknown, the uncertainty, the fear and concern about your performance in the battles yet to come, the sense of empowerment from training, sacrificing, visualizing and feeling.

Success builds confidence and only fuels you for success.

Audiovisual: During his last tour of duty in Iraq, Zembiec was killed in action in Baghdad.

More than 1,000 mourners, many of them soldiers under his command, attended his funeral.

Zembiec was awarded the Medal of Honor for his heroism.

Ms. Zembiec: Douglas is with us now and looking down, and is most honored that he has become an inspiration for others.

Mr. Ford: Lieutenant Commander Andre Coleman of the U.S. Army, a close friend of the Zembiec family, will accept the NCAA Award of Valor on behalf of Major Doug Zembiec and will speak for the Zembiec family.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Presenting the Award of Valor to Lieutenant Commander Andre Coleman in honor of Doug is Chet Gladchuk, director of athletics at the U.S. Naval Academy. (Applause)

RESPONSE — LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ANDRE COLEMAN

Lieutenant Coleman: Be a man of principle. Fight for what you believe in. Keep your word. Live with integrity. Be brave. Believe in something bigger than yourself. Serve your country. Teach, mentor. Give something back to society. Lead from the front. Conquer your fears. Be a good friend. Be humble and be self-confident.

Appreciate your friends and family. Be a leader and not a follower. Be valorous in the field of battle and take responsibility for your actions.

Those are principles my father taught me.

This is a passage from a notebook of Major Douglas Zembiec — husband, father, son, brother and warrior. These words serve as a daily reminder of the lessons that Doug shared with me.

Valor, be a warrior on the field of battle.

Doug isn't here, so we are honoring him with the Award of Valor.

But what is valor? Where does it come from?

This was derived from the Latin, be worthy, be strong. But it always comes back to boldness or determination in facing great danger, especially in battle.

Courageous and brave — I believe there could be no better description of Doug.

Is this courage there when you need it or is it developed and nurtured through the games we play, through the friends we keep, through influences in our life?

Many of you may have heard of his exploits before today, first described as an unapologetic warrior, and then given a moniker — lion of valor.

Through the reference of a lion, the warrior cries, and in describing his own Marines and their brave deeds, it was like that for Doug.

"Marines have fought like lions and will continue to do so," he said following the battle.

One of his friends said: "Zembiec could be found inspiring the Marines to repel the enemy's determinative assault." In the words of his own Marines: "There is no one better to go into war with."

Sergeant Major Will Skile: "His love for the Marines far surpasses anyone else I know. I don't think there are enough words to describe him as an individual.

"This is Captain Daryl Akers. He is everything you want in a leader. He will listen to you. He will take care of you and back you up. But when you need it, he will put a boot in your"

Sergeant Casey Olson: "He is not like some of those other officers, he leads from the front and the rear."

Corporal Jacob Atkinson: "I am reminded after a funeral speech: 'Day-by-day, fix your eyes upon the greatness that has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it.'"

Lieutenant Joseph Clearfield had this to say of Doug: "Doug is a typical modern officer. He is not typical in that he led us into combat."

These words may be a picture of Doug, the Marine, but I would like you to know about Doug, the friend, the athlete, the wrestler. I started dating my wife back in 2001 around the same time that Doug started dating his future wife, Pam.

During that summer, the four of us spent a great deal of time in the D.C. area. It was important for me to have my then girlfriend to get to know the people in my life that meant so much to me.

Late that summer, I had to leave for a one-year deployment to Southeast Asia. All things simplified, but our world was changed by the events of 9-11, realizing that I was a world away and would not always be able to be reached by phone, I told Stephanie that if ever there was anything she needed and I could not be reached to call Doug Zembiec because no matter what the requirement, no matter what the time ... and no matter where he was ... I could trust he would always be there for me and my loved ones.

Doug was not just my friend, he was my brother.

On my wedding day, there was no other person I could think of to walk my mother down the aisle.

I stand before you with joy and sadness in my heart. I am joyful because my friend, Doug Zembiec, is being honored for his accomplishments both on and off the mat, but at the same time I am saddened that Doug cannot

be here to accept this himself.

Doug never took part in any action for the fame or the credit. He simply put his all in every task at hand, and if that task happened to be a wrestling match, then God help the man on the other side.

Talking to Doug about wrestling and life at the Naval Academy, Doug was always open to perspective.

“The wrestling,” he explained, “was like doing battle — two men in the circle, and the final test begins.”

I say “final” because, as Doug put it, it started deep down and that is the way we started training. The biggest battle was the internal ones, push yourself and test your own limits.

Stepping in the circle was the only step in the journey. There is a poem that most wrestlers know by an unknown author.

It starts:

“Here is a man of flesh and blood,
He was not made of rock
He had ordinary stock,
But somehow he was different
as the true athletes always are.
He curses and sweats and
Bled so he could take pride in his part.”

I can hear these words to describe Doug.

He was different. He was what every coach looked for. He was what every athlete wanted to call a teammate.

And in this class of ‘95, there were five friends who came to a highly competitive program and solidified their roles as starters and future leaders.

He called me, a Navy wrestler and a member of the class of ‘95, and I was not a member of that five. It was Curt Kyle, relentless worker, Mike Clayton, the technician who is now himself a college coach, Major Kip Walters, Dan Shea, the heavyweight, and they would call him the puncher.

And then there was Zembiec.

He was non-stop, a combination of all the aforementioned descriptions.

He kept coming at you with both guns blazing.

When Doug was on the attack, which was always, he knew that if he got any part of you, you were in for a battle.

Those who wrestled against him thought he was made of rock.

Doug pushed himself both on and off the mat to prove himself daily.

I was with Doug a couple of times when the coach wanted us to use inner-tubes and do jumps across the gym floor.

That was not enough for Doug. He had to go the extra mile so he had to add hoops. During the free practice run, he decided that running was not enough, he was going to jump off the bridge and swim back to the academy, convincing others such as myself to follow his lead.

Much like his wedding day, when he decided that we all needed to strip out of our dress uniforms and go for a swim in the water that runs alongside our alma mater, life was always interesting around Doug. In Curt’s words, Doug was definitely the hardest-working, fun-loving guy on the team.

Like everyone else, he knew I felt lucky for having known him, and as many have said, because he is no longer around.

Another teammate, Joe Geary, who cannot be with us today, simply had to say this: “Doug came at you non-stop. He beat you mentally. His technique made him a good wrestler. His heart and determination made him a great wrestler. That is what I remember watching him on the mat.”

A two-time state wrestling champion from New Mexico, Doug came to the Naval Academy full of promises and tenacity. The Naval Academy developed him mentally and physically, and to the higher ideals of leadership.

Doug was such a leader both on and off the mat, and the mental toughness he honed over the years in wrestling served him well in the Marine Corps.

Doug served as a role model and inspiration to both young and old. This past November, his high school remembered our friend, Doug, and honored his memory by dedicating the wrestling room to him.

Two of Doug's greatest passions were wrestling and mentoring, and although Doug can no longer be with us, I hope his legacy will go on to inspire the youth of tomorrow.

Doug was a leader, his military achievements obviously reflect that. The Marine Corps gave him that opportunity to see it manifested much earlier through his wrestling.

Dream, believe, achieve ... these were words from his personal journal.

It is often said that a successful journey begins with the fellow's will. My friend Doug had both character and a will to succeed. We honor him today because he was not only a good wrestler, but he represented those ideals that have made our country what it is today — self-sacrifice for a greater good.

Doug took the lessons he learned throughout life, and he was a champion.

This is another passage from Doug's journal. I believe his own words paint a picture of the man that we came here to honor.

"Whenever I step on the mat, I always remember I represent my team and my school. I was part of something bigger than myself."

I thank you today for giving me the opportunity to speak about my friend. Thank you, Pam, and Mr. and Mrs. Zembiec for giving me the opportunity to remember Doug and to speak on behalf of Doug. (Applause)

SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. Ford: We have sadly learned over the last few years about the real definition of a hero.

We have learned it has nothing to do with wealth, fame or, in fact, celebrity that our office bestows. We learned that a real hero is an ordinary person who, when confronted with an extraordinary fight, that they are capable of doing extraordinary things.

These stories tonight have surely proven that both Emily and Doug were indeed true heroes. So this evening, we offer our congratulations and our most profound gratitude to their families. Thank you again. (Applause)

The next group of honorees you will meet tonight are the NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipients.

The Silver Anniversary Award recognizes former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of the completion of their athletics eligibility.

Joining us tonight as Silver Anniversary honorees are pioneers in their sports and barrier-breakers in their profession. Their push to become champions as student-athletes carried over to their careers and community service after graduation.

Theresa Andrews, University of Florida

Our first Silver Anniversary honoree is credited with one of the greatest upsets in Olympic swimming history. Her selflessness immediately after her outstanding performance is what remains an important part of her family legacy.

Audiovisual: Olympic gold is precious. It represents years of practice and sacrifice, which is what makes former Florida swimmer Theresa Andrews' gesture so powerful.

She gave her gold medal away.

Andrews' brother, Dan, was paralyzed in a bicycle accident when he was 19. Andrews presented her first Olympic gold medal, won during the 1984 Summer Olympics, to Dan in a private ceremony.

Theresa Andrews: He said Theresa, you and I have a common goal together. I said what is our common goal? He said we are not going to accept someone putting limitations on us.

Audiovisual: Andrews earned the gold medal by winning the 100-meter backstroke in Los Angeles at the summer games. Her performance was voted one of the top-10 greatest upsets in Olympic swimming history. She picked up a second gold that year as part of the first-place 400-meter medley relay team.

Andrews began her career at Indiana University, where she won six Big Ten titles in 1981. After transferring

to Florida, Andrews helped the Gators to the school's first NCAA Division I swimming and diving championship. She was part of the 200- and 400-yard medley relay teams that won NCAA championships that year. And she won another NCAA championship in the 400-yard medley relay the following year as well.

An 18-time All-American, she was a part of four SEC champion relay teams. Andrews received her bachelor's degree in therapeutic recreation from Florida and went on to get a master's degree in clinical social work from Ohio State University.

Currently, Andrews is the senior vice-president in consumer banking for MBNA/Bank of America. She has also worked as a clinical social worker in the pediatric cancer services area of the University of Virginia Health Sciences Center.

Dan Andrews: She uses her own inner inspiration to inspire other people to achieve, which makes her a great person in the business she is in.

Audiovisual: With her Olympic movement forever frozen in time, Andrews continues to demonstrate the true Olympic ideals in her daily life.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Florida, Theresa Andrews. (Applause)

Presenting her award tonight is Skip Foster, assistant to the athletics director and former assistant men's and women's swimming coach at the University of Florida. (Applause)

Todd Blackledge, Pennsylvania State University

After a career in professional football, our next Silver Anniversary honoree has become a Saturday night fixture on college football telecasts. He has a single-season record of 22 touchdown passes, and is tied with Penn State's all-time career touchdown leader with 41.

Audiovisual: Penn State won the 1982 national championship over No. 1-ranked Georgia in the Sugar Bowl, where Blackledge was voted the most valuable player with a Penn State bowl record 228 yards passing.

Todd Blackledge: This was the ultimate victory, my last college game, and I will never forget what that feeling was. You never want to feel like you cheated yourself or cheated your teammates, or cheated the fans of your school or your team by not doing your very, very best.

Audiovisual: He was the 1982 Davey O'Brien Award winner as the nation's top collegiate quarterback, and he donated the \$10,000 award scholarship to Penn State's Renaissance Fund, aiding tuition costs for lower-income students.

In 1983, Blackledge was the first Penn State quarterback selected in the first round of the draft. He played professional football for seven years, throwing for 5,286 yards and 29 touchdowns for the Kansas City Chiefs and the Pittsburgh Steelers during his career.

Blackledge remains active in his community as an assistant varsity basketball coach and a Little League and youth basketball coach, but it's obvious Blackledge has found his niche as an analyst.

The job as restaurant critic, however, is another story.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Pennsylvania State University, Todd Blackledge. (Applause)

Presenting Todd's award tonight is Tim Curley, director of athletics from Pennsylvania State University. (Applause)

Cormac Carney, University of California, Los Angeles

After never having ridden the bench as a football player, the next Silver Anniversary honoree has worked both sides of the bench in his professional career as an attorney and as a United States district judge.

Audiovisual: Breaking down defenses and out-maneuvering the coverage prepared Cormac Carney well for a future defending clients and balancing the scales of justice as an attorney and later a federal court judge.

Carney experienced tremendous success as a wide receiver for UCLA from 1980-82. He ended his career as the Bruins' all-time leading receiver with 108 catches, 1,999 yards and eight touchdowns in three seasons.

Twice he was an all-Pacific-10 first team member, garnering honorable mention All-American honors as a senior. In his three years at UCLA, the Bruins were 26-7-2, including a win over Michigan in the 1983 Rose Bowl.

Twice named a first team academic All-American, Carney won an NCAA postgraduate scholarship.

Cormac Carney: I don't look back at the individual success. The thing that means the most to me and what I remember is what I accomplished as part of a team.

Audiovisual: After finishing his degree at UCLA, he graduated from Harvard Law School in 1987. He was a litigation partner at a private firm before becoming a state and federal judge.

Carney was nominated by President George W. Bush and later confirmed as a United States district judge in 2003.

He devotes significant time speaking and participating in legal community events and doing pro bono work for local bar associations. He also serves on the board of directors for UCLA's alumni association.

Mr. Carney: How I measure my success is, am I happy? And I've never been happier.

David Carter: All those values that you teach in athletics for men and women on these playing fields across the country just personifies who Cormac is.

Audiovisual: As a collegiate football player, Cormac Carney spent his time dodging defenders. As a federal judge, he works to treat people fairly on both sides of the line of scrimmage.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of California, Los Angeles, the Honorable Cormac Carney. (Applause)

Presenting Cormac's award tonight is Dan Guerrero, director of athletics at the University of California, Los Angeles. (Applause)

Anne Donovan, Old Dominion University

Our next Silver Anniversary recipient is the youngest of eight siblings, all but assuring her of anonymity while growing up. However, it was soon apparent that her prowess on the basketball court would guarantee her a place in the spotlight for the rest of her life.

Audiovisual: For someone who spent her adolescence craving anonymity, Anne Donovan has spent a lifetime above the radar, not to mention above the basket, in the sport of women's basketball.

Donovan led Old Dominion University to the 1981 AIAW national championship and then to the NCAA Women's Final Four in 1981 and 1983.

She shot 63 percent from the field and still holds the NCAA record for career blocked shots with 801.

She led the United States women's basketball team to gold medals in 1984 and 1988 as a player, and again in 2004 as an assistant coach. Donovan is the head coach for the U.S. team that will compete in the 2008 Beijing Summer Olympic Games.

Anne Donovan: I feel very blessed to have the tract in the Olympics that I have. I am really looking forward to getting to Beijing, and hopefully coming away with the gold.

Audiovisual: The two-time CoSIDA academic All-American and NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner played professionally in Italy and Japan before returning to the states to serve as an assistant coach and head coach at the collegiate level.

With the emergence of the WNBA, Donovan moved to the professional coaching ranks, becoming the first female coach in the WNBA to win 100 games. She coached the Charlotte Sting to the championship finals and spent four years as head coach of the Seattle Storm, winning the WNBA championship title in 2004.

Anne Donovan: It's a great career and it's a very exciting time, for women everywhere to see the development of a women's professional sports league.

Audiovisual: Donovan spends extensive time in the community. During her coaching stint with the Seattle Storm, she was a member of the Seattle Storm Reading Timeout Program and the WNBA Boys and Girls Club Be Fit Program.

As a leader in women's basketball and an ambassador in her community, Anne Donovan stands head and shoulders above the crowd.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Old Dominion University, Anne Donovan.

Presenting Anne's award tonight is Carl Hudson Jr., sports director at Old Dominion University. (Applause)

Dot Richardson, University of California, Los Angeles

It's practical to suggest that all of the success the Silver Anniversary honorees have enjoyed is a measure of their competitive playing days. I mean, after all, they are 25 years removed from college when supposedly they were in their prime, but we would be selling our next winner short if we assumed any such thing.

Audiovisual: In a career that has spanned more than 15 years as a player, from her collegiate playing days at UCLA to her time as an Olympian, Dot Richardson has many fond memories from the sport she loves. Ask her what her greatest moment in sports would be and the woman who put softball on the international map will tell you without hesitation.

Dot Richardson: The 1996 Olympics was a dream come true for me. By hitting the first home run in Olympic history, and having another one, and then the home run in the gold medal game, your first thought is, "Wow, for us to have that gold medal around our neck for the first time in Olympic history in the sport of fast-pitch softball, it's pretty cool."

Audiovisual: A career .367 batter, Richardson led the Bruins to the 1982 NCAA college series title. She was a three-time All-American and was named the NCAA player of the decade for the 1980s. Her career, as it turns out, was just getting started.

She was a two-time Olympic gold medalist, a four-time Pan American gold medalist and USA softball's most valuable player four times during a 15-year span. As recently as the year 2000, Richardson was taking the field with players 10 years her junior to represent the United States on the world stage.

A natural leader, Richardson has used her advanced medical degrees to further the benefits of staying physically fit at all stages of life. She is the vice chair of the Presidents Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

Dot Richardson: We need to inspire others to continue to be physically active or to get physically active, for their health.

Audiovisual: Richardson's day job is as medical director of the USA Triathlon National Training Center in Florida. She also is a corporate spokesperson for 14 nationally recognized companies. She has designed and implemented softball camps and clinics in more than 50 U.S. cities and has produced an instructional videotape library on softball.

Ms. Richardson: All of us have been given amazing gifts, and for us to honor those gifts, it's really to do the best we can do in everything we do. Being an NCAA student-athlete prepared me for a lot of these challenges.

Audiovisual: In a day when outstanding performances are sometimes denoted with an asterisk, Dot Richardson's accomplishments are measured by the sheer guts and determination with which she played the game she loves.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of California, Los Angeles, Dr. Dot Richardson. (Applause)

Presenting this award tonight is Dan Guerrero, director of athletics at the University of California, Los Angeles. (Applause)

Robin Roberts, Southeastern Louisiana University

Our next Silver Anniversary honoree has been under the bright lights ever since graduating from college, as a reporter at various small-market television stations, then in a breakthrough role on a fledgling cable sports channel, and more recently as an early morning news show anchor.

Audiovisual: To describe Robin Roberts as versatile might be a bit of an understatement. She has had to showcase her versatility and talent in two traditionally male-dominated arenas — reporting so-called hard news for a network and anchoring a major sports newscast for a growing cable entity. And she has had to do it the old-fashioned way. She has earned it.

Robin Roberts: I don't think I would be sitting on this set of "Good Morning America" had I not been a student-athlete, and I mean that with every ounce of my being.

Audiovisual: As an anchor for ABC's "Good Morning, America" and before that as a correspondent for ABC News, Roberts has dealt with nearly every major news story of the last several years.

Before landing her job with ABC, Roberts was best known for her work at ESPN, where she did everything

— WNBA play-by-play announcer, “SportsCenter” anchor, and in-studio host for the NCAA Women’s Final Four. Her hard work paid off, earning her three Emmy awards for her sportscasting work.

Roberts always set her goals high, and her rise to the top probably came as no surprise to her fellow students and teammates at Southeastern Louisiana University.

As a guard for the Lions, she ranks among the school’s leaders in scoring and rebounding, recording more than 1,000 points and 1,000 rebounds — one of only four players in school history to achieve that distinction.

Through her position with “Good Morning, America,” she helped launch “GMA Gets It Done,” a year-long initiative to get her hometown of Pass Christian, Mississippi, up and running after Hurricane Katrina.

Ms. Roberts: The fact that I am now so involved and so community-minded started in college ... started as being an athlete.

David Westin: She understands the audience, and part of what this means is she has a very deep commitment to community service, to going out and helping people who are less fortunate than she is.

Audiovisual: Robin is also the namesake for the Robin Roberts Sports Journalism Scholarship to help advance women in sports journalism careers. In 1984, she was inducted into the Women’s Institute on Sport and Education Foundation’s Hall of Fame.

No doubt a role model for many young girls, Robin Roberts has paid her dues and perhaps helped smooth the road for other female journalists.

Mr. Ford: From Southeastern Louisiana University, Robin Roberts. Presenting her award tonight is Dr. Joel Erdmann, athletics director, Southeastern Louisiana University. (Applause)

As a member of the news media, our final Silver Anniversary honoree has never hesitated to go where the story is, even if it means traveling to dangerous places during dangerous times.

Audiovisual: For Colgate University’s Bob Woodruff, the lessons he learned playing intercollegiate lacrosse served him well during his days as a student-athlete and even more so as a reporter in Iraq.

The four-year letter-winner holds Colgate records for career goals scored and single-season goals scored. He ranks second in career points with 184 and was voted his team’s most valuable player during his senior year.

Woodruff graduated cum laude from Colgate with a degree in English and went on to earn a law degree at the University of Michigan.

While teaching law in Beijing, he was hired by CBS News to be a translator during the Tianamen Square uprising.

Woodruff joined ABC News in 1996 covering major stories all over the world. His reporting of September 11 was part of ABC News coverage that was recognized with the Alfred I. Dupont and George Foster Peabody Awards. In 2005, he was named co-anchor of ABC’s World News Tonight.

David Westin: Bob has a remarkable enthusiasm for reporting. It’s a combination of fearlessness and a deep and wide curiosity about events, particularly around the world.

Audiovisual: In January of 2006, Woodruff was seriously injured by a roadside bomb while reporting on U.S. and Iraqi security forces. After a rigorous recovery, the success of which he attributes to his days as a lacrosse player, Woodruff returned to work in February 2007.

Bob Woodruff: I think one of the things that you learn when you play sports is that you have to deal with pain. There is a technique to get better as opposed to worse, and if you can take that out of sports in terms of improving to other parts of your life, then you can improve better in those as well.

Audiovisual: Woodruff chronicled his injuries and recovery in a memoir called “In An Instant,” a book he co-authored with his wife, Lee.

He and his family have established the Bob Woodruff Fund for Traumatic Brain Injury to raise money to assist members of the military.

As someone who firmly believes in the lessons sports teaches individuals, Bob Woodruff has turned the good fortune of his recovery into a meaningful way to help men and women who are wounded in service to our country.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, Bob recently received another overseas assignment and is unable to join us tonight. Since Bob couldn’t be with us tonight, he recorded this message to express his gratitude for being named

a Silver Anniversary honoree.

Mr. Woodruff: I just have to say I can't thank you all enough for this remarkable honor.

And all of you honorees — I just want to thank being amongst you as well. I want to say especially to Robin Roberts, who I know very well here at ABC and I knew all of these years, what an amazing athlete she is, and she deserves this way more than I do.

I do want to thank Colgate University, where I did play three different sports, but ultimately the one I loved the most was lacrosse. They gave me the opportunity to play that game and play remarkable teams, and stay in contact with the other guys who I played with there is remarkable.

I would love to be there right now, but I can't make it because I had to travel all the way across the ocean over to Sudan to do a story.

At this very moment, as far as I can tell, this is going on and I am doing very well now in Sudan.

I just wanted to pass on my best to you and thank you again so much for this remarkable honor.

Mr. Ford: Accepting the award on Bob's behalf tonight is David Roach, director of athletics at Colgate University. (Applause)

It's unfortunate that Bob Woodruff couldn't be with us this evening, but we are delighted the other honorees are here and we get a chance to chat a little bit with all of you.

My first question is, and I will throw it to you, does it seem like 25 years?

Ms. Roberts: It wasn't 25 years ago. This is an exception for us. We realize at 25 years we are very honored that you have decided to allow us earlier than the 25 years, and we thank you for that.

Mr. Ford: We wanted to see how the hairstyles were very different from 25 years ago. Let me ask some questions about what you have done and the impact you have had on people.

I will start with you first, Dot.

I was doing a story on her for NBC News at the time. I had my daughter with me. She was 16-years-old, a sophomore in high school. She had immediately migrated to Dot, and Dot was one of the energizing forces.

Dot sent the book she wrote afterwards. My daughter kept it on her bookshelf. I want you to know that my daughter went to college at Yale and will graduate from Wake Forest Medical School in about four months.

She has looked to you for inspiration.

My question is, what will you say to our Top VIII winners out there or other young student-athletes who will be watching this about their capacity to inspire other people?

Dot Richardson: I loved hearing the Top VIII about defining success. It is not necessarily being one up or one point ahead of the other team, but basically giving it the best you have in everything that you do.

You learn that success is often impacted on the lives of others, making a difference in the lives of others.

Sometimes it can be either one instant when you meet a youngster and the life is changed forever.

You never knew that it happened, and here you share the best that is sweet. I will have to tell you that is so great.

Mr. Ford: We talked about inspiration ... But your own personal inspiration.

Robin, you said in your piece a few moments ago you believe your sports prepared you for journalism ...

Ms. Roberts: I think all of us, the ones who you tonight have heard talk about how they have now gone on to do something.

The intangibles that you learn through playing sports, the foundation, the essence of everything that I am started with me being involved as a student-athlete. It is a phenomenal feeling.

But the sacrifices that you have to make, the goal setting. I mean ... the basics of what you think are basic ... but the sacrifice that went into that ... It's the same thing with journalism — the same approach. I approached everything, everything that I have ever done as I have as a student-athlete.

Mr. Ford: Cormac, I should say as a former trial lawyer, it is not often I get to ask a judge a question.

How about parallels in preparation as a football player, an athlete and becoming a lawyer and a judge?

Mr. Carney: Absolutely. Practice, practice, practice.

The law is like an adversary system. It is very competitive. What I would have to do is I would practice my arguments over and over again. I would practice my witness' examination, and then when I have to write a brief,

edit it, re-edit it until it was right.

John Wooden used to say: “Failing to prepare was to prepare to fail.”

I never forgot that.

Mr. Ford: Todd, when we introduced you, we talked about a national championship at Penn State ... Phi Beta Kappa ... a professional career as a television broadcaster ... and as I said — it may well be that your greatest fame will be as a “diver.”

Mr. Woodruff: I hope that isn’t my greatest fame.

I love college football. I have tremendous passion for the game of college football. I am very thankful for the job I have.

We found out that we struck a real chord with the people who loved college football. Whether it is tailgating, whether it is a little hole in the wall that every college town has, people just loved it. We had a lot of fun doing that.

Mr. Ford: One of the interesting things about college football is that you look at your fame from 25 years ago. It doesn’t look that different. The equipment is basically the same and not that different.

What have you found in your travels? Are there any differences between the student-athletes of your days and the student-athletes who you encounter today?

Mr. Woodruff: I think there are certain differences just because the guys have gotten bigger and stronger and faster.

When I played, if you had a 300-pounder on your team, they were overweight and couldn’t play.

Today, every team has 300-pounders on both lines and they are athletic-type guys.

In that sense, it has changed. In our sense, it hasn’t changed because it still gets down to a lot of the same basic fundamentals that we have heard about.

One of the things that I think is great about sports is that you learn perseverance, and I like to call it the fourth-quarter mentality.

I think if you understand that and you understand that you play until there is no time left, as long as you have a chance you are out there fighting, that is a great carry-over for life in anything that you do. I think those lessons that people still learn today, whether it is 2007 football players or 1907 football players, that is still the same.

Mr. Ford: When we talk about lessons and learning, Anne, you became a towering presence in the game of women’s basketball at a time it had not received any of the popularity that it has now.

I imagine as a taller young woman it was an unusual position to be in.

What lessons did you learn about confidence and self-esteem that you can pass on to young people today?

Ms. Donovan: I came from a big family, one of eight kids. I developed some confidence within my own family.

But carrying it into a team sport where I had teammates, coaches and spectators who graded who I was as a basketball player, as a young woman, it just continues to grow my confidence and I continue to love this game.

I developed outside of my family into an individual and into a career and profession that I actually love.

Mr. Ford: Theresa, along with some others here, had Olympic experiences. Certainly, that is a higher level of preparation and practice and success and sometimes failure.

How did your experiences on the collegiate level prepare you to become an Olympian and then prepare you for what you have now?

Ms. Andrews: As we have heard from other awardees, I think college teaches you to balance things in your life. As I was pursuing the Olympic gold medal and trying to make the Olympic team, I had to balance other parts of my life.

When you are consumed by one thing, you will fall short. In balancing my family and my friends, I think I was enjoying it at that time.

The same applies in academic careers. As a student-athlete, it was not only about pursuing swimming, but pursuing my degree.

Trust other team members. I learned as a student-athlete to achieve a gold medal, you don’t do it by yourself. It is larger than just the team, it is the community that you belong to.

You have to be willing to give help and receive help. I learned that early at the University of Florida.

Mr. Ford: We talk about how sports helped prepare for a law career. Can you tell us how you used sports to prepare for a career in medicine?

Ms. Richardson: When you look at it, in medicine, it is about really focusing and working as a team to the ultimate goal of caring for the patient.

You talk about eye coordination and that ability. But I think more importantly, it comes from caring. I am here for you.

That is what it is in sports on the team. We all care for that common goal beyond victory, about being the best we can be.

In light of the position that you can be the best you can for your patient, is the incredible feeling to give back that way.

Mr. Ford: Robin, what is the message from our successful athletes 25 years later?

Ms. Roberts: What is this about — this 25 years later? (Laughter)

Mr. Ford: I had my silver anniversary 10 years ago. That makes it really later, so you are kids up here. What is the message that you can send out to our Top VIII and other young people out there?

Ms. Roberts: They are well on their way. I am so proud of them and so proud of the NCAA for the opportunity institutions like Southeastern Louisiana have.

Enjoy the moment.

Cut yourself a little bit of slack.

We, as student-athletes ... what an honor and what a privilege.

I think especially from 25 years ago we were student-athletes.

There was a mistake in the piece that said I was a guard. I was a center. Anne was a center. I had to go pro in something else.

So that is about using the skills as a student-athlete to go on into different professions.

Just enjoy yourself and be of service to others. That is the bottom line.

Mr. Ford: It has been a great joy for all of us to look back at what you were and what you all became. Congratulations from all of us to all of you.

We thank you for your messages and your inspirations. (Applause)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Our final award of the evening is the NCAA's Theodore Roosevelt Award, also known as the Teddy, the highest honor bestowed upon a former varsity student-athlete.

Strength and resolve have been characteristics of former Teddy winners, often shown in their accomplishments long after their NCAA student-athlete experience has ended.

A football player at Muskingum College in Ohio during his college days, the 2008 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award winner set a transcontinental speed record and orbited the earth three times before settling down for a life in the United States Senate.

Audiovisual: The need for speed propelled Ohio native son and Muskingum College's John Glenn, to unprecedented heights throughout his life in the United States military and as part of the country's fledgling space exploration program during the 1950s and '60s.

As one of the country's first space cowboys and later a U.S. senator, Glenn went from challenger to champion, and proved that honing his skills in the classroom and on the fields of competition can also help to serve the greater good throughout one's life.

As a student-athlete at Muskingum, Glenn played both football and basketball.

Annie Glenn: Sports were always important to him.

He wasn't the star, but I went to every game, and he enjoyed it.

John Glenn: My memories of Muskingum are very good.

I liked going to school. I enjoyed it, and I enjoyed the athletics.

Time there at school was cut short because Pearl Harbor had occurred right in the middle of my junior year.

Audiovisual: Glenn entered the Naval Aviation Cadet Program, graduated from the program and was commissioned in the Marine Corps in 1943.

After advanced training, he joined Marine Fighter Squadron 155 and spent a year flying F4s in the South Pacific.

All told, he flew 59 combat missions during World War II.

At the conclusion of the war, Glenn spent time as a flight instructor at the Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi, Texas, until his ultimate goal was granted — a transfer to combat in Korea, where he took part in 63 combat missions with Marine Attack Squadron 311 during the Korean War.

In 1957, he set a transcontinental speed record, flying from Los Angeles to New York in three hours and 23 minutes as part of Project Bullet, an accomplishment that secured his reputation as one of the country's top test pilots and opened doors for his participation in the nation's newly emerging space exploration program.

As part of NASA's Project Mercury, Glenn became one of the country's first astronauts.

On February 20, 1962, Glenn piloted the Mercury Atlas 6 "Friendship 7" spacecraft on the first manned orbital mission for the United States.

Launched from Cape Canaveral, he completed a successful three-orbit mission around the earth.

Possibly more important than his space mission was the impact it would have to the United States in helping the country close the gap with the Soviet Union in the global space race.

Mr. Glenn: It was the depths of the Cold War. It was a time period when there was a lot of pressure and a lot of emphasis on what we were doing, which sort of added to the idea that we better do a good job.

Audiovisual: But public service was never far from his mind.

His friend, Robert Kennedy, encouraged him to run for political office, and in November 1974, Glenn was elected as a United States senator representing his home state of Ohio.

As a member of the Senate, Glenn chaired the Committee on Governmental Affairs and sat on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

He was awarded an honorary doctor of science degree in engineering from Muskingum to go along with the multiple honorary degrees he has received from nine other colleges and universities.

He and his wife founded the John Glenn Institute for Public Service at Ohio State University.

The institute's mission seeks to improve the quality of public service and to encourage young people toward careers in government.

Satisfying his constant love for adventure and further cementing his image as a daredevil, Glenn became the oldest person to fly in space when he took his most recent space ride in 1998 aboard the Space Shuttle Discovery as a payload specialist.

Throughout a life defined by amazing margins — the shortest transcontinental flight, the first American to orbit the earth, the oldest human to venture into space — John Glenn's public service to his country remains perhaps the most meaningful mark in his pursuit of excellence.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the 2008 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, from Muskingum College, the Honorable John Glenn. (Applause)

Presenting Senator Glenn's award tonight is NCAA President, Dr. Myles Brand. (Applause)

RESPONSE — JOHN GLENN

Mr. Glenn: Thank you all very, very much.

I must say after sitting here this evening and listening to all these other presentations tonight, I really truly do feel inadequate to be compared to some of these people.

Some of the things they have done and their dedication are truly amazing.

There are some other people who also should be honorees.

It is all of you out there who participate and who are the coaches and trainers and the people involved with all of these programs.

You work full time in that field. You affect young lives in good patterns that last a lifetime.

Your programs challenge each person, you challenge individuals, you challenge each and every student to excellence that has been repeated here this evening.

To set goals beyond what they think — what they think they can do with your counsel, your advice, your coaching, your help — they do rise above their own expectations and they do it and make up their minds.

As has been said here this evening, they just do it.

In a larger sense, I guess that is really what education is all about. They learn to compete with those skills with each other or with themselves, and then they combine them with others in teams where the individual becomes part of working together for something bigger than just him or herself.

As all of you know, the first time it has happened you really have a whole different feeling about yourself and about the group.

Working together creates lessons that we need today — lessons that go far beyond just our stadiums and our athletics fields.

That can-do attitude usually does carry over to campus community and beyond, so your impact, those of you in the audience, is tremendous and rightly so.

I mentioned in the opening the pattern you set for conditioning and healthy lives and healthy beings last a lifetime.

All of the people on your team don't want a pro career.

There are not just that many positions open. They do learn lessons out of football, basketball and all the other competitive sports, whether individual or team.

I believe that you can do that goal setting and that the challenge to excellence that you start as an athlete remains just as important the older we get.

I have some experience with that, thank you.

Because, of course, there may be some physical changes to be dealt with, but you know the important thing is the attitude in keeping up with exercise and a healthy lifestyle.

I think those are fundamental things that you learn from competitive sports that do last you all of your life.

There have been many jokes about getting old going around on the Internet these days, and I seem to be a recipient of a lot of them.

A lot of people send me these things, and I get a kick out of them.

I thought you might get a kick out of a couple of them tonight.

I think one of them illustrates at least the way I just mentioned about some of your physical abilities changing as you get a little bit older.

A friend of mine, a pilot, just a short time ago sent me an e-mail in which he said had I heard the one about the three elderly pilots walking out across the ramp?

The first said, "It is windy." The second looked at him and said, "No, it is Thursday." The third one said, "Me, too. Let's go get a beer."

I can relate to that one. (Laughter)

There's another one I got that you might enjoy me sharing with you.

I got a letter from a boy in Illinois.

He wrote as follows, and this one sort of sums up the problems of aging in a pretty good way. I will not give his name.

He said: "I am nine-years-old and in the third grade, and I wish you could come. Just recently, I had to do a biography report, and I picked you because I wanted to know more about the first American to orbit the earth.

"I loved reading about your life. We had to make a presentation. I made a poster and dressed up like an astronaut."

He asked a couple more questions and finished with this, which I think is a real classic: "I am glad you are still alive, because a lot of my classmates' biographies are dead. I hope you write back."

That seems to put it all in the proper place.

Anyway, my sincere congratulations to the honorees here tonight.

What a great group. I don't know how you could assemble a better group of people than those who have gone across this stage this evening.

I am just honored to be a part of that and to be here with you as a group.

I congratulate you and wish you every success.

God bless every one of you. (Applause)

Mr. Brand: Muskingum College has been known for athletics and academic achievement through the years.

It is now my honor to present Ann Steele, president of Muskingum College, with the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Institution Award. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Senator, thank you so much for gracing us with your presence. We are delighted to provide you with the highest honor that the NCAA bestows.

Congratulations again to all of our award recipients.

In hearing your stories, we have certainly come to know the meaning of excellence and how each of you pursued your dreams athletically and professionally.

We have a greater appreciation for what it took for you to go from challenger to champion, to rise from average to excellent.

That wraps up the awards presentations.

A television broadcast of tonight's event will be aired Friday, February 1, at 3 p.m. Eastern on ESPN 2.

Thank you for joining us for the 2008 NCAA Honors Celebration.

It's been a special night in recognition of the pursuit of excellence.

To our award winners, congratulations. To all of you, thank you for joining us.

Good night.

[The Honors Celebration was adjourned at 9 p.m.]

DIVISION I FORUM

JANUARY 12, 2008

The Division I Forum was called to order at 12:30 p.m., by Joe D’Antonio, chair of the Legislative Review Subcommittee.

OPENING REMARKS

Joe D’Antonio (Big East Conference): Good morning. Welcome to the Division I Legislative Forum. My name is Joe D’Antonio, the commissioner for governance and compliance of the Big East Conference and chair of the Legislative Review Subcommittee of the Management Council.

Before we begin with today’s festivities, I would like to take an opportunity to introduce the other individuals on the dais.

To my immediate right, Steve Mallonee, managing director of membership services, Division I governance liaison and staff liaison with the Legislative Review Subcommittee; Lynn Holzman, director of membership services and staff liaison with the Legislative Review Subcommittee; Debbie Richardson, senior associate athletics director, SWA at Campbell University, and a member of the subcommittee; Cindy Masner, senior associate athletics director, SWA, at Long Beach State, and also a member of the subcommittee.

To my immediate left, Peggy Hefferan, associate AD, SWA, at Wagner College; Carol Iwaoka, associate commissioner, Big Ten Conference; Jackie Campbell, associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference; and Shane Lyons, associate commissioner at the ACC.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to welcome you here today. Hopefully, this will be a productive and informative session for you. I have been in this business for a little over 10 years now, and I conduct no session in which we deal with legislative proposals, legislative topics, or anything to do with legislation in general unless we always have something that I call INAAC.

We deal with acronyms all the time in college athletics — SWA, PSA, NLI, APR.

INAAC stands for “It’s Not All About Compliance.”

Today, I have just a very couple of short items for you. INAAC can be anything.

First of all, I have a little bit of this day in history for you. On January 12, 1958, the NCAA added the two-point conversion to football scoring.

In 1966, Batman with Adam West and Burt Ward premiered on ABC.

In 1969, Super Bowl III, the New York Jets beat the Baltimore Colts, clearly one of the most famous games in NFL history.

In 1971, “All in the Family” premiered on CBS.

I also want to make sure I give you a little quote today, something you can keep in mind both during this meeting and after the meeting and as you go forward during the rest of the time at the Convention.

This is by Lee Iacocca:

“No matter what you have done for yourself or for humanity, if you can’t look back on having given love and attention to your own family, what have you really accomplished?”

That is just a little INAAC to get you started.

This session is held to review and discuss the legislative proposals that comprise the 2007-08 NCAA legislative cycle.

It is also meant to provide an opportunity for the membership to both comment and discuss items associated with proposals that are in the cycle.

Please note and bear with us that the three override proposals will not be discussed in this session. The override vote will be occurring at 2 p.m., after this session has concluded.

You have all been given handouts for purposes of today’s discussions. There are copies of the Official Notice at the back of the room if you need one.

We will take the Official Notice section-by-section during our discussion as we review the legislative proposals.

We will look at a certain section. For example, recruiting, and one of the members from the subcommittee will discuss proposals that we have identified under that certain section. After that identification and presentation has taken place by the subcommittee member, we will give folks in the audience an opportunity to comment not only on the proposals that were introduced, but if people have pertinent comments on other proposals in that section, that will be the time to bring them up.

I remind all of you that no matter where we are on the agenda, this session ends at 1:50. We will have a 10-minute break and the override session begins at 2 p.m.

We would like to turn to the first section in the Official Notice. That is the personnel section, a subsection of recruiting.

I will call on Jackie Campbell, associate commissioner at the Atlantic 10, to walk us through Proposals 07-16-A, 07-16-B, 07-17, 07-18, 07-35 and 07-36.

Jackie, the floor is yours.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FORUM

Jackie Campbell (Atlantic 10 Conference): Thank you, Joe.

The first proposal that I will talk about deals with personnel and recruiting coordination functions, the first of which is Proposal No. 2007-16-A, which can be found on Page 13 of your Official Notice.

This proposal would eliminate the restriction that all recruiting coordination functions must be performed by a countable coach, while maintaining the prohibition that only an authorized countable coach may place calls to prospective student-athletes and be involved in off-campus recruiting.

Some of the points that you would want to consider when evaluating this proposal is that it would eliminate restrictions that have only been in place since August 1, 2006, for sports other than football.

As you know, this has been a long-standing rule within the sport of football, but it was adopted a year-and-a-half ago for all other sports.

It retained the restrictions on who may initiate calls to prospective student-athletes, although the staff would be permitted to receive calls, and there is other legislation that prohibits off-campus recruiting by non-coaching staff members.

Also, the current legislation requires that most of the duties be performed by countable coaches, which may stifle the development of non-coaching staff members. For your information, the recommendation of the Legislative Review Subcommittee is that the Management Council defeat this proposal.

Proposal No. 2007-16-B would allow non-coaching staff members to prepare general correspondence currently limited to countable coaches.

This proposal begins on Page 17 of the Official Notice. Some of the points to consider with this proposal is that it would provide flexibility in the preparation of recruiting correspondence, but it would preserve the overall intent of the original legislation, limiting core recruiting functions to countable coaches. It also alleviates some administrative burden on coaches.

The Legislative Review Subcommittee recommends approval of this proposal.

The next proposal, Proposal No. 2007-17, which can be found on Page 18 of your Official Notice, deals with volunteer coaches.

It will permit a volunteer coach to engage in recruiting coordination functions, including evaluation activities on campus, provided he or she has successfully completed the coach's certification exam.

The points to consider in this proposal are that it applies only to sports other than football and basketball. It would again ease administrative burdens on the countable coaches. It could provide valuable experiences to volunteer coaches.

If we were to expand the duties related to volunteer coaches, is that really contrary to the original intent of having the volunteer coach?

The Legislative Review Subcommittee is recommending that the Management Council defeat this proposal.

The next proposal is Proposal No. 2007-18, which begins on Page 21 of the Official Notice.

This proposal would basically permit non-coaching staff members to make or receive telephone calls to prospects, their parents, legal guardians or coaches, and to prepare general recruiting correspondence that would be sent to prospects, parents, legal guardians and coaches, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent.

For those institutions that don't use the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport or for prospective student-athletes who are not eligible to sign a National Letter of Intent, for example, a four-year college transfer, those individuals would have to accept the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid.

Some of the points to consider with this legislation is that it would provide flexibility once a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or offered admission or athletics aid. Essentially at this point in time, your recruiting process is over and your attention is now turning to pre-enrollment activities.

It could also possibly result in some additional monitoring activities.

The Legislative Review Subcommittee is recommending that the Management Council approve this piece of legislation.

The next proposal is Proposal No. 2007-35. As we have been discussing in this area, the current legislation limits the making and receiving of telephone calls to prospects or their parents, or legal guardians or coaches who count in numerical limitations.

There are a few legislative exceptions, and this proposal would add the faculty athletics representatives and your senior women administrators to those who would be permitted to return calls to prospects, prospects' parents, legal guardians or coaches.

There are points to consider. It would only allow those individuals to return telephone calls as opposed to initiating them.

By interpretation, also the faculty athletics rep and the senior women administrator could also return written correspondence.

Similarly, it could actually result in some additional monitoring activities since they would have to make sure that the telephone calls that are returned are subject to the limitations on the number of telephone calls that you can make, so you have to make sure that you are monitoring those things.

The Legislative Review Subcommittee is recommending that the Management Council send this proposal out to the membership for additional comment.

The last proposal we are going to review in this section is 2007-36, which is similar to 2007-35 in that it would add the strength and conditioning coaches to the list of exceptions of coaches who could receive telephone calls from a prospective student-athlete, provided the calls relate to summer conditioning programs and the calls occur after the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent, or for those institutions not subscribing to the National Letter of Intent, after the signing of acceptance of the student's offer of admission or financial aid.

The points that you should consider when evaluating this proposal is that once again it would restrict the strength and conditioning coaches from receiving calls, and they have to be related to summer conditioning programs and only after a prospect has signed an NLI or accepted an offer of admission or aid for those institutions not subscribing to the NLI.

This proposal would not apply to walk-ons. Even though you can send pre-enrollment information to those individuals, your strength and conditioning coach could not receive a call from a walk-on. Another thing to note is that if Proposal 2007-18 is adopted, it would render this proposal moot, and once again there is probably some additional monitoring issues that may result with this proposal. The Legislative Review Subcommittee is recommending that the Management Council defeat this proposal. Are there any questions on these proposals or any others in these two areas?

Mr. D'Antonio: We had a few proposals in the personnel section and a few proposals in the recruiting section. Is there any discussion or comments associated with the proposals that Jackie presented?

Mike Matthews (Pacific-10 Conference): We sponsored 2007-16-A. As Jackie mentioned, the roots of that rule are very deep. They go way back into the early '90s when the Association was really seriously concerned about the proliferation of personnel.

We adopted a number of rules to try to combat that. Some of you may remember the restrictive-earnings coach. This was one of them to limit recruiting activities by not having recruiting coordinators in the name of non-proliferation. But if you stop and take a look now on your campus, it would be pretty easy to say that that proliferation of staff members wasn't really happening.

We have got lots of other people working on our campuses doing things for our sports that this rule did not prevent from having. So for our conference, the choice really boiled down to this: Is it worth it to have to go through all of the legislative minutia, all the interpretations, all the suspicion that we are the only school in America that is abiding by these rules and I know everybody else is not, all in the name of non-proliferation, when there is a pretty good argument that could be made that non-proliferation didn't happen?

So, at a minimum, if I have not changed your mind about supporting this proposal, perhaps it would be a good idea if all the proposals that are somewhat related in this package go out to the Management Council and have them send it off to the membership for comment to see what the membership thinks about all of these various proposals.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thanks, Mike. Any other comments just on the proposals that were presented by Jackie?

Seeing no other people approaching the microphone, I am going to turn to Shane Lyons for presentation regarding Proposals 30-A, 30-B, 30-C, 07-42 and 07-43.

At the end of Shane's presentation, we will take comments and discussion on the proposals that Shane has presented and other proposals that are listed in both the personnel section and the recruiting section.

Shane, the floor is yours.

Shane Lyons (Atlantic Coast Conference): Thank you, Joe. For those who are following along in the Official Notice, on Page 47 is the start of Proposal 30-A. You have three different alternate proposals dealing with 30-A, B and C. I will try to summarize those and then put them altogether in one lump summary.

Proposal 30-A in men's basketball will specify that the institution may have two in-person contacts with prospective student-athletes during their junior year in high school during that April contact period.

In addition, the proposal is indicating that during the contact period in April, only live evaluations can occur that involve those prospective student-athletes involved in nonscholastic or scholastic activities involving their high school, preparatory school and two-year college contests for that individual.

The evaluations of those individuals can only be by those institutions at which those regular scholastic activities do occur.

Proposal 30-B removes the contact in the junior year with the prospective student-athlete, but would still specify that the evaluations of the live activities during the April contact period shall still be limited to those high school, preparatory school and two-year college contests of the student-athletes enrolled in the institutions where their regular scholastic activities occur.

Proposal C, which is the third alternate proposal to this, does eliminate the junior contact period. The school maintains the evaluation of live activities only on scholastic-based activities and only at those institutions that the prospect attends.

Proposal C adds in the amendment to the current April contact period in men's basketball and amends the calendar that we will look at here in a second.

Looking at all three proposals together, Proposal A has the two-year college contacts; B and C do not. Looking at Proposals B and C, you do have the scholastic activities evaluations during April and only at those regularly scheduled activities and contests.

Proposal C is different from that. It does amend the current April contact period in the April men's basketball calendar.

Looking at the current calendar, you will see the dates marked in red are the current dead periods and green indicates the contact periods in men's basketball that we currently have.

The next slide will show you what the amended part of C would do in men's basketball. Yellow references the quiet period. Green is the contact period, and red would be a dead period in men's basketball.

When looking at these three proposals, some of the things to consider is that it does eliminate evaluations of nonscholastic events in April.

For those of you who have dealt with men's basketball in April trying to determine whether coaches can go to these events or not, it always becomes very confusing.

The confusion related to these events would be eliminated and we would go only to scholastic-based activities.

The legislation that we previously had in 2002 through 2006 did allow contacts with juniors. We had amended that legislation and gone back.

Proposal A would try to amend that legislation to have contacts with junior prospects. Looking at these proposals, the LRS would recommend defeat of Proposal A and would prefer 30-C as the proposal in looking at all three of these lumped together as a group.

Let's move on to Proposal 2007-42, which starts on Page 76 of your Official Notice. Proposals 42 and 43 kind of go hand in hand, but I will start out with Proposal 42, which deals with football evaluations.

This proposal specifies that all evaluations shall be limited to regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school and two-year college practices in regular scholastic activities involving prospects enrolled at the institution in which those scholastic activities occur.

This would be the entire contact and evaluation period.

The difference in Proposal 43 is in football and specifies that those evaluations during the spring evaluation period shall be limited to those scheduled high school, preparatory school and two-year college activities conducted under the supervision of the high school coach.

Looking at the slide comparing the two side by side, it would eliminate evaluation, non-institutional camps and clinics at any time.

With Proposal 42, the question at hand is if the effective date should be modified to August 1, 2008, if the proposal is not adopted by the Management Council and the Board of Directors with its immediate effective date. If it does go out for comment to the membership, it would be recommended that the effective date be modified to August 1, 2008.

Proposal No. 43 would eliminate those evaluations at camps and clinics, but that would only be during the spring evaluation period. Would such events move to the other contact period in the fall if it was not during the whole academic year?

With that being said, the LRS would support the approval of Proposal No. 42 and recommend defeat of Proposal No. 43.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you, Shane.

Are there any comments or discussion points with regard to any of the items that Shane has presented to the group or any of the proposals listed in the personnel section or the recruiting section of the Official Notice?

Jim Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): In our conversations about these proposals, the one area that kept percolating up was concerns from the coaches' standpoint. I would say the vast majority of the schools are still trying to sign seniors in the spring, and that April evaluation period for them isn't about juniors and sophomores, but really it is about seniors because they missed out on some kids who have decided to go elsewhere. They're notified of that in March-April, and all of a sudden they are scrambling to try to find prospective student-athletes who they may pursue to offer a scholarship.

Carolayne Henry (Mountain West Conference): I would like to talk about an additional recruiting proposal that currently is not on your list.

I would like to draw your attention to Proposal No. 2007-52. This is related to national service academies.

On behalf of the United States Air Force Academy, I would urge your support of this proposal.

I believe there have been some misunderstandings regarding the proposal. Basically, it is asking to allow service academies to contact prospects during their junior year in high school. This came about back in the summer when there was a congressional mandate that would allow for service academies to contact juniors in high school so that they could assist them through the admissions application process.

For those of you who are unaware, to get admitted to one of the national service academies, you need a congressional appointment. Typically, there is a time line that the students fill out on an application and then the October to mid-November time frame is when the interviews take place with the respective congressmen or congresswomen.

In this particular instance, it would not be additional contacts for the Air Force Academy or any other service academy. They would simply like to have the opportunity to help guide their prospects as juniors through the application process.

Are there other questions? I also have Rich Fullerton here. He is also from the United States Air Force Academy. Colonel, I would like to turn it over to you.

Richard Fullerton (U.S. Air Force Academy): Carolayne stated it pretty clearly.

Actually, I am surprised she gave me the microphone. They don't usually trust me in public venues like this. The point is that it is a very extensive process to get admitted to a service academy.

Most of our admissions comes through congressional appointments. That process takes a lot of time. Our candidates have to have fitness tests, physical exams, the liaison officer interviews, congressional interviews, and all this occurs generally before the official contact period starts.

So we are just simply asking for the opportunity to contact people who we are interested in a timely manner that will allow us to meet that time frame. I know some people think this gives you a recruiting advantage.

My answer to that would be, first, it restores the language to what the original intent was in 1976, based on the congressional language.

The second thing is we are not asking for any additional contacts. It's the same number of contacts, it's just in a timely manner so that we can get the folks through the process.

I would conclude with the point that if you really want to level the playing field, I think the way to do that would be to require all recruits at all schools to serve a five-year service commitment after graduation. That would level the playing field.

Thank you for your time. I hope you will support that proposal.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you for those thoughts.

For those who are astutely paying attention and scoring at home, you may note that we have for the meantime skipped over the amateurism section. We will be come back to that. So please bear with us.

Right now we are taking comments and discussion with regard to the proposals that Shane presented and other proposals in the personnel and recruiting section.

Jarrell Johnson (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Seeing there are no other comments on 2007-52, we would like to ask if we could draw your attention to 2007-44, please. I represent the student-athletes of the Summit League. Today, I am speaking on behalf of the Division I SAAC and all student-athletes who are part of the Division I team.

The Division I national SAAC supports Proposal 2007-44 concerning all student-athletes' welfare. Prospective student-athletes enroll in some courses to prepare themselves for the rigors of college life. That has proven to be the most effective way for a teenager who is away from home for the first time to adapt to that way of life.

Balancing class, rest and the increasing competitive nature in collegiate athletics can also be a very demanding load, as we know. This legislation would afford the same privileges for the walk-on student-athletes and create a sense of camaraderie between the scholarship and the non-scholarship athletes, which establishes an inclusive environment that will contribute to their success.

We understand that you may have concerns about budgeting and staffing issues, but the cost is minimal compared to the impact on all student-athletes. The NCAA was established to provide a safe, fair and competitive environment for student-athletes to not only cultivate their potential but excel on and off the field.

This proposal will certainly provide that opportunity. Please join us in supporting 2007-44.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you very much. Any additional comments on the personnel section or the recruiting section? Seeing no other individuals approaching any of the microphones, is there any comment or discussion associated with any of the proposals listed in the amateurism section of the Official Notice?

Seeing no one approaching the podium, in the interest of time, we will now turn our attention to the eligibility section. I would like to re-introduce Cindy Masner, senior associate athletics director and SWA at Long Beach State, who will discuss with us Proposals 07-61 and 07- 63. Once again, we are now in the eligibility section.

Cindy Masner (Long Beach State University): Proposal 2007-61 can be found on Page 110 of your Official Notice. Proposal 2007-61 would establish for individual sports a hardship waiver calculation for the first

half of the season using the number of days an institution declares during the championship segment. This would be quite different than what team sports use for their calculation.

The proposal further specifies that the denominator in the percentage calculation would include the maximum number of permissible dates of the competition, plus one date for the conference championship if you were to have one. This would be regardless of the number of competitions scheduled or completed.

This proposal would simplify the calculation for individual sports and provide consistency. The first half of the season is calculated by counting the days between the first competition for any individual and the end of their conference championship if they have one.

This would allow a coach to know the definitive date to qualify for a hardship waiver. The denominator in the percentage calculator is determined by the maximum contests, plus one, if you have a conference championship.

The LRS has recommended a modification to the effective date, and the new legislation, if adopted, would apply to student-athletes who missed a season of competition due to an injury or illness after August 1, 2008, and then the current rule or new legislation could be used by a student-athlete who missed a season of competition before August 1, 2008. The LRS recommends approval and forwarding the proposal to the Division I Board of Directors.

Proposal 2007-63 can be found on Page 116 of your Official Notice.

This will provide the opportunity for a prospective student-athlete to receive early certification as a qualifier, provided they have achieved the test scores and core-course requirements outlined in this legislation.

There are some points to consider in this legislation. In 2007-08, a pilot waiver was used for early certification. Under the pilot program, 45,000 prospects were certified early. Projections for this near calendar year are 25,000 to 30,000 prospects.

Research has shown that those who meet the early certification standard outlined in this legislation would also meet the general standards. Certification would begin once the proposal is adopted for those entering institutions full-time on or after August 1, 2008.

The LRS recommends approval and forwarding the proposal to the Division I Board of Directors. It is also included in the consent package.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you, Cindy. Before moving on to Debbie Richardson, who will also discuss a couple of eligibility proposals with us, are there any comments or discussion on the proposals presented by Cindy?

I would like now to turn our attention to the eligibility section, and once again re-introduce Debbie Richardson, senior associate athletics director and SWA at Campbell University, to deal with Proposal 07-66 and Proposal 07-67.

Debbie Richardson (Campbell University): Proposal 07-66 and Proposal 07-67 both deal with two-year transfers and correspondence-related items.

Proposal 07-66 specifies that in order for a transfer student from a two-year institution who was not a qualifier to be eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition in his or her first year of residence, he or she must successfully complete six semesters or eight quarter hours of English, and three semesters or four quarter hours of math at the two-year college that they are currently enrolled in, and the transferable hours must go toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

The same proposal, which was 06-66, was defeated last year. A second point to consider is that the two-year transfer student-athletes will be better prepared.

If you note in the rationale statement, this is related to degree progress.

It is also related to assistance and the prevention of potential problems. The required English and math course work will allow student-athletes to be more prepared to succeed when they arrive at the certifying institution.

Are the institutions at a disadvantage?

Institutional policy is the key here. Some institutions may accept transferable degree credit and some may not based on this policy. Would it result in a recruiting advantage? This legislation has been forwarded to the membership for comment.

Proposal 07-67 relates to correspondence, extension and distance-learning courses, and specifies that each type of course taken from an institution other than the two-year college in which a student-athlete is enrolled as

a full-time student shall not be used to fulfill the two-year college transfer requirements. This is found on Page 122 of your Official Notice. This proposal is intended to address the use of such courses at the last minute to fulfill transfer requirements. Is this less restrictive?

The second point to consider is that the proposal precludes the use of possible legitimate courses.

Third is that it may be difficult to identify these types of courses based only on a review of the transcript.

One factor is that it does place quite a burden on the certifying institution.

Finally, should it be an institutional decision as to which courses are accepted? That question will be subject to membership comment.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you very much, Debbie, for that presentation. We certainly appreciate that. We will now take comments and discussions associated with the proposals in the eligibility section, both presented and other proposals that are in that section.

Gregory Sankey (Southeastern Conference): I am a bit intimidated in having the entire room at my back. I will talk to the table and hope that all of you will understand.

Proposal 2007-66 is identical to the bylaw that the Southeastern Conference has had in effect for much of the last decade. We have found that it encourages student-athletes who are nonqualifiers and have not met academic standards at a high school and who very well may not have passed an English course since ninth, 10th or 11th grade, or a math course during that same period of time. It makes a statement to those student-athletes that before enrolling in the upper level of a four-year college that they need to do some work in English and in math because that will help you succeed academically in your last two or three years of collegiate enrollment.

It is restrictive. The recruiting impacts are negligible since the vast majority of student-athletes are likely going to be put in some form of English and math course at the junior college anyway. But it does catch and direct student-athletes in a very specific direction.

Proposal No. 2007-67 is a new idea for us. I think it is time that we acknowledge that there are concerns related to the correspondence and distance-learning classes that are increasing.

It doesn't mean that all of those classes are flawed. It doesn't mean that everyone who has experience in distance-learning or correspondence courses has done something inappropriate, but we start to narrow the window and start to direct two-year college students back to their campus to complete the course work needed to transfer and meet our two-year eligibility requirements — either on their campus in the classroom setting or through these unique opportunities that are continuing to grow that are offered by their campus.

We encourage your support for both of these proposals. We think it is in the best academic interest of our incoming student-athletes in the future.

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern (Ivy Group): I am here to talk to you about Proposals 2007-23 and 2007-60.

These are proposals that originally came from the Tennis Coaches Association. They are exceptions for prize money limits for tennis prospects and a deduction in the current one-year grace period allowed before enrollment for tennis players.

The Ivy League agreed to sponsor this package of proposals at the request of the Tennis Coaches Association, because we were persuaded that there are amateurism issues that are unique to tennis that need to be addressed by the NCAA, and we wanted to get this issue on the agenda and start the discussion of how to resolve these issues.

The tennis coaches have worked hard and have come up with what they thought was the right solution. The executive director, David Benjamin, is here to provide you with a little more context and what those problems are and how the tennis coaches are going to resolve them.

David Benjamin (Tennis Coaches Association): I would like to thank the Ivy League for sponsoring these proposals. I would also like to thank the NCAA staff for spending a great deal of time with our organization working on these questions and trying to find good answers. I also would like to thank the NCAA amateurism subcommittee for spending a great deal of time with us.

We began these discussions in the summer of 2006 in Indianapolis and had the chance to meet with many of the NCAA staff.

There were problems in the Division I varsity tennis season, both men and women, that had received a great deal of visibility in the media and were causing a great deal of friction and unhappiness among our coaches and among our student-athletes.

We wanted to find a way to make the environment much more positive for both the student-athletes and all of the coaches and administrators, and all of the prospects looking at college tennis.

Over the next fall, we surveyed our membership. We had basically town hall meetings. We had over 78 percent of our Division I men's and women's membership respond to detailed questionnaires, which the operating committee of our governing body reviewed and came up with these two proposals. We had a chance to meet in person with the amateurism subcommittee and our understanding is that the subcommittee was and remains supportive of these proposals.

Our concern is twofold. One, the world has changed and the tennis world has changed. As those of you who follow tennis know in watching the U.S. Open, tennis is a very, very international sport. Our best young players, both American and from other countries, are playing in events all over the world where the concept of amateurism as it existed 50 years ago no longer exists.

It is very, very difficult and very confusing for our young players to follow the rules as they now exist. Our suggestion has been to modify the rules so that the expenses up to the cap of \$10,000 that are incurred by all of the young players do not have to be reported in great detail. We feel that is consistent with the spirit of amateurism and would be a tremendous solution to take away a lot of the unhappiness, a lot of the frustration and thousands and thousands of hours spent by parents, young players and administrators. That is one element to the proposal. The other element is linked very, very closely and would reduce the one-year grace period that exists in college tennis and swimming and diving to encourage young prospects to begin their educational experience as soon as possible.

We feel this would encourage the concept of the educational continuity that right now in the sport of tennis is not as strong as we would like it to be. Basically, what we are asking for is fairly revolutionary. We understand that.

It is revolutionary in the sense that it involves looking at what would be most helpful for the well-being of the student-athletes in the sport of tennis on a sports-specific basis. In 1990 in Indian Wells, I had an hour meeting with Dick Schultz, the executive director of the NCAA, to discuss similar problems. At that point in 1990, Dick Schultz said I had to be just a little patient, because the NCAA was moving in the direction of sports-specific approaches.

That was 18 years ago, and I think this is a good time for the NCAA to look very carefully at this possibility. Political change is in the air, and I would like to think that that might be possible here, too. We realize that the NCAA is going through changes in terms of its governance structure, and we would like with great respect to submit to the Management Council that they look carefully at this proposal and also consider possibly that it might continue to look at it as the NCAA changes its structure over the months ahead.

Jeff McDonald (Vanderbilt University): I am the women's tennis coach at Vanderbilt University. Welcome to Nashville. I have coached for 20 years. I have played college tennis for four and I played professionally for a few years. I echo what David said about the global nature of this game.

I am astounded at how much you all are having to assimilate and absorb. I know that tennis is often a minor sport and not given its moment in the sun. This is ours. As coaches, we have worked incredibly hard and come together and compromised to put these proposals before you.

I realize they may seem a bit threatening; the idea of prize money is a slippery slope. The first focus was in 2006 when the idea of coming to college right away, and having an academic continuum promotes education. It is what the NCAA is all about.

I ask the NCAA members, and in particular the Management Council, to really pay attention to tennis. Don't just dismiss this. Put it away and examine it and study it. Over the last few years, this has been a really divisive issue. The status quo is not acceptable. It will not work. It has created unbelievable divisions between coaches and a decline in sportsmanship. In the last year with these proposals, the tennis community has come together. The coaches have really united.

There has been a huge shift. It may be one of the larger moves on this issue. I used to be adamantly in the amateurism corner; if you took a nickel, you can't play. It isn't reality. If you want to say that, then no international player could come to the states. I don't think anyone wants to say that. The rest of the world is not amateur, particularly in tennis. To ignore that creates some cynicism and a lot of problems.

Think for a second. Here is one of the main issues. It isn't money, it is experience.

If you allow players to play the tour, not go to high school, take time off, play two or three years and come in at 20, they play an 18-year-old who has been in high school. The 20-year-old is going to win.

I have spoken with international players who are now in coaching and they say it really wasn't even fair. I am 22, 23 and I am playing a 19-year-old. It is 2-0 in the first, and I hit him. I beat him 2-0. That is what is happening.

This has a chance to heal the game of tennis, and I know many of you think prize money is a slippery slope. It is already a slippery slope, ladies and gentlemen. There is already a huge number of players who have earned prize money and made money.

They are often reinstated, and it has created a real problem. One school can recruit a player, another school says no you can't. That player goes to another school and wins. It creates a lot of division. I urge you to look at tennis for a few minutes. Don't put us aside.

We have worked very, very hard. The coaches have come together. Former enemies are shaking hands and sportsmanship has increased.

Matt Dobbins (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): If there are no other questions or statements about this proposal, I would like to move to Proposal No. 2007-68.

Mr. D'Antonio: For purposes of continuity, the chair would like to recognize the speaker at Microphone No. 5, who apparently does have a comment on this particular proposal and then we'll proceed to No. 68.

Mr. Dobbins: Thank you.

Kathy DeBoer (American Volleyball Coaches Association): My name is Kathy DeBoer, and I am the executive director of the American Volleyball Coaches Association. I am speaking to the tennis proposals. We want you to take a really hard look at the tennis proposals.

The issues that the tennis coaches are talking about are not unique to tennis. The world has gone global.

The ways of training athletes in other countries is very, very different from our own. We are watching very carefully to see what you do with these tennis proposals because they are, in fact, appropriate to some other sports in which amateurism issues are very, very difficult and divisive within the sport.

Mr. Dobbins: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I play baseball at Jackson University. I represent the student-athletes at the Atlantic Sun Conference and speak on behalf of the national SAAC and all the rest of the Division I student-athletes in support of 2007-68. The mission of the Baseball Academic Enhancement Working Group was to increase the APR in the sport of baseball.

Supporting this proposal is consistent with that of the initial mission.

Proposal 2007-68 will not affect the APR. If a student-athlete seeks a better opportunity for themselves, then why should they be penalized for pursuing that opportunity? This is a student-athlete well-being issue in which baseball walk-ons will be the beneficiaries.

For student-athletes, sitting out a year from their sport means an extra year of unnecessary monetary expenses that could be readily avoided with this proposal. In addition, this proposal forces baseball coaches to make informed decisions to decide to give walk-ons athletics aid.

Ultimately, Proposal 2007-68 enhances student-athlete well-being, and that is why the national SAAC supports it. Some may argue that this legislation promotes transferring, but that is not the case.

With the new legislation and the roster cap of 35 and 27 counters, that leaves a roster spot of eight for walk-ons. Even if a couple of these walk-ons transfer, college baseball will only have a minute number of transfers. In this situation, the needs of the student-athlete will be met without compromising the APR. The national SAAC supports Proposal 2007-68.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments for the eligibility section? Seeing none, we are going to move forward. I am going to skip over to the financial aid section. We will move to the awards, benefits and expenses section.

I am going to re-introduce Carol Iwaoka, associate commissioner of the Big Ten, who is going to take us through 07-78 and 07-79.

Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference): I would like to refer you to a Q&A document that you should have received that has some references to Proposals 78 and 79 on Page 12. For those of you who are interested in reading the NCAA language, please refer to Pages 139 and 149 in your Official Notice.

Both of these proposals, 07-78 and 07-79, are related to meals incidental to participation. They are both sponsored by the Management Council and were developed as a result of concerns needed to ensure that the nutritional needs of student-athletes are being met, or as some would call it — the Big Mac versus Subway argument.

It is also intended to address the complicity of the application of the current legislation as it relates to the number of meals per day, whether you have a pre- or postgame meal or whether you had those meals in addition to three meals per day, or whether or not you had a snack. If you didn't have a snack, then maybe you could have the postgame meal. It also is attempting to relate to whether cash should be provided in lieu of meals.

These two pieces of legislation were developed with the help of surveys from the SAAC and from institutions that participated so that the membership could have a better understanding, not only of its current practices, but really what is going on in terms of student-athletes' receipt of money versus receipt of meals.

The Legislative Review Subcommittee is recommending that both go out for membership comment. We will focus on 07-78, which has to do with the types of meals the institution can provide at both home and away-from-home competition. What this proposal really does is provide a second option when you are providing meals at away-from-home competitions.

That is, that meals can be provided at the institution's discretion once the student-athlete reports until the team returns to campus. This is an option to what you can already do, which is three meals or cash allowance per day, plus the pre- or postgame meal on the competition day.

This option would provide the membership legislation that would standardize what institutions are doing for both home-and-away contests.

There are slight differences in the time frame as to when you can apply these discretionary meals.

At home, it begins the evening before competition until the end of competition, and the student-athlete is released. For an away-from-home contest, it begins when the team is required to report until the team returns to campus.

That distinction is needed in order to be able to provide meals to student-athletes, for example, during the return trip home. It continues to permit the option to provide cash options for postgame meals. For those of you who have had to monitor and comply with meals legislation, the intent is to simplify the monitoring of the complexity of the current legislation.

I am going to move to 07-79 and provide some additional food for thought. Proposal 07-78 deals with meals related to competition. Oftentimes the other part of the meals incidental to participation has to do with what happens after the game is over.

Proposal 07-79 permits an institution to provide student-athletes at home or away-from-home competition either a postgame meal or cash in lieu of the meal, not to exceed \$15. Of course, this is an increase from the current \$10.

This is based on when the student-athlete is released by the institutional personnel. For home competitions, meals could be provided up until the student-athletes are released. Upon release, an additional \$15 for a meal can be provided. It allows for the postgame meal at \$15 for an additional meal upon release.

One of the things in developing the postgame situation is that not every student-athletes leaves with the team. For example, if you are competing away from home and the student-athlete is there and has family or friends, this provides a little bit more flexibility for the institution than to say we are going to feed you, we are going to release you, here is \$15 should you want to get your postgame meal instead. Both proposals would be effective August 1, 2008. As I mentioned, they are being recommended for comment.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you, Carol. Are there any comments or discussion associated with Proposal 07-78 or 07-79 or any other proposals in the awards, benefits and expense section? Hearing and seeing none, I have just two very quick items.

I would like now to turn our attention to the financial aid section of your booklet and re-introduce Carol and our staff who will work with us on Proposal 07-110. You also have a handout at your area associated with this proposal.

Ms. Iwaoka: The proposal in the Official Notice is on Page 135, and again I refer you to a handout that hopefully will assist and answer several questions that the membership has raised regarding the application of a proposal that would specify institutional financial aid based on any degree of athletics ability may not be reduced or canceled during the period of its award because of an injury, illness or physical or mental medical condition.

Many of you are already aware that the concept originated with the Committee on Women's Athletics as it related to concerns regarding the protection of financial aid for pregnant student-athletes. It is a student-athlete welfare issue.

In many ways, this proposal does not change the current legislation as it relates to an institution's ability to reduce or cancel a student-athlete's aid during the period of the award as it relates to a student-athlete rendering himself or herself ineligible, providing false or inaccurate information regarding their eligibility, serious misconduct warranting disciplinary penalties, and it is also consistent with the ability for an institution to continue to be able to include nonathletically related conditions for the continued receipt of aid.

In addition, it does not affect the institution's ability to reduce or cancel aid as a result of a team suspension, it being understood that the student-athlete always has an opportunity for a timely hearing regarding the actions taken by the institution.

Hence, the document that has been developed by the staff is really a document that I hope will assist you in understanding the legislation. Again, it specifies that aid may not be reduced or canceled during the period of the award and offers those definitions in terms of the application of what the period of the award means.

The proposal does not affect the annual renewal or nonrenewal process. Again, I would like to emphasize that the proposal does not affect the permissible reduction or cancellation of aid for legislative reasons that are already in the existing legislation.

With that, I would like to ask if there are any questions or comments on 110?

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you, Carol. Are there any comments or discussion on 110 or other items in the financial aid section of the Official Notice?

Brittany Loisel (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I play softball for Rutgers University and represent the Big East Conference. I am here on behalf of the National Division I SAAC and every student-athlete in the nation who is in support of Proposal 2007-110.

Over the past decade, schools across the nation have realized that medical conditions such as pregnancy and alcohol abuse not only occur in collegiate athletics, but in some instances may be more prevalent than originally thought.

Currently, student-athletes have very limited financial protection for physical and mental-health issues that may or may not prevent participation in athletics.

In these situations, financial aid decisions are more often left in the hands of the coaches. For this reason, the Division I national SAAC supports Proposal No. 2007-110. I am here to speak on behalf of every Division I student-athlete in the nation who does not have the opportunity to do what I am doing.

I am their voice. I am the voice of the student-athlete from Clemson who feared losing her scholarship so much that she chose to give up her own child, as was reported by ESPN last year. I am the voice of the student-athlete who has struggled with drugs and is afraid to come forth for fear of what may happen to his or her financial aid. I am their voice.

If Proposal 2007-110 is supported, we as student-athletes, will know that we have the resources and the support available to make an educated and informed decision about our situation. One can only imagine the courage it must take to seek the support and guidance from a coach or administrator when dealing with a medical condition, and the threat of losing your financial aid can only make that decision to seek help more difficult.

As I mentioned earlier, current legislation allows institutions the ability to make their own decisions regarding these situations. In rare instances, this responsibility has been taken advantage of through team contracts or agreements. Accountability needs to take place here and now by providing these student-athletes necessary financial protection.

We need to know that our institutions are not only committed to us as students and as athletes, we need to know that our institutions are committed to us as people. Please join Division I student-athletes in support of Proposal No. 2007-110.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you, Brittany. Is there any additional discussion on this proposal or other proposals within the financial aid section? That would move us to the last three proposals that you will see listed on today's agenda, which are Proposals 07-25, 07-27 and 07-28, all known as the student-athlete likeness proposals. I wish to inform the group that the Legislative Review Subcommittee does not have a specific presentation prepared in conjunction with these three proposals.

It is our understanding that at the Management Council meeting tomorrow, the Management Council will be asked to table these three student-athlete likeness proposals in deference to not only these proposals being further reviewed and studied, but also the concept in general that these three proposals be further reviewed and studied by a presidential task force that is being formed.

We do have a couple of minutes left if folks want to discuss or make comments associated with these three proposals or other proposals that may be listed in the Official Notice that we have not yet covered. This would be the time.

Ted Gumbart (Atlantic Sun Conference): As an alumnus of the LRS group, I thank you all for the work you have done in preparing for today's forum.

I do want to address 2007-107, which is a proposal regarding core status for the purpose of a conference qualifying for men's basketball AQ. It is a proposal that we believe strongly in the rationale, but at this point our proposal was introduced before the advent of the current moratorium.

As our proposal is rooted in some of the fairness concerns that we have related to the previous moratorium, we do feel it is appropriate to recognize the note that LRS made on that proposal. They did not recommend approving it. They recommended defeat, but that it could be addressed in a yet-to-be formed moratorium study group.

So with that note being made, I would like to concur with that judgment. We wish to withdraw the proposal with the understanding that it will be given fair consideration when that group does its study and as we come out of the next moratorium. If the membership sees fit, we can address it in whole through that as it was during the last moratorium.

So make a note that the proposal is withdrawn, but the idea and the concept is not. It is going to be referred and hopefully addressed through that means.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments either on the likeness proposals or proposals that we have not yet studied?

Patrick Henry (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The SAAC would like to propose 2007-83 for discussion, please.

Mr. D'Antonio: Please proceed.

Mr. Henry: I'm a former soccer student-athlete from Siena College. I represent the student-athletes from the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Sherraine Pencil (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am a Mountain West Conference representative and I am a track athlete at San Diego State.

Mr. Henry: We are here on behalf of the national SAAC and all Division I student-athletes from across the nation.

Division I student-athletes support Proposal 2007-83. We support this proposal for three main reasons.

First, this proposal encourages student-athletes whose eligibility has been exhausted to remain in school in an effort to complete their degree while allowing them to pursue the necessary practice and training time in order to prepare for a career in professional athletics.

Second, this proposal will help to alleviate some of the tremendous pressures facing these student-athletes as they try to determine whether or not to go into professional athletics by limiting the choice between either finishing their degree or having access to more practice time.

Third, and most importantly, the logic of this proposal is consistent with the policies, missions and goals of the NCAA.

If this proposal is passed, it will send a clear and positive message to all student-athletes. That message is as a student-athlete you can do both.

You can complete your degree and still engage in a high level of practice and training that are necessary to enter professional athletics.

Ms. Pencil: I am currently in my last year of eligibility. Next year, my eligibility will be exhausted, but I have all intentions of trying to become a professional athlete.

I have all intentions if Proposal 2007-83 is passed to make use of that proposal and work with my coach to develop my skills. Just like we develop our skills in the classroom, we need to develop our skills as an athlete.

So remember when you decide to vote for 2007-83, it's a vote to support athletes like myself who has that dream to become a professional athlete.

Mr. Henry: Everyone in this room is familiar with the NCAA slogan that has become famous throughout our promotional commercials. There are over 380,000 NCAA student-athletes. Almost all of them will go pro in something other than sports.

This proposal concentrates on that small minority of student-athletes who may pursue a career in professional athletics — student-athletes such as Sherraine, student-athletes who are so dynamic they have potential to pursue a career in athletics and a nonathletic career.

We ask you to encourage this dream and support it. Encourage these student-athletes to pursue a diverse variety of goals. We thank you for your time and we hope you will support student-athletes by voting in favor of Proposal 2007-83. Thank you.

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you for those comments.

Beth Bass (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): I would like to speak to playing and practice season Proposal No. 2007-88.

On behalf of our WBCA membership, and particularly the WBCA member coaches representing our Division I institutions, I ask you to send this proposal out for comment.

We do not support the fact that this women's basketball-specific proposal was not submitted through the WBCA legislative process we have established within our association, so we did not use the NCAA membership's time with proposals that have not been supported by our coaching community.

The WBCA legislative process we have put in place in Division I suggests that you consider women's basketball-specific proposals that have received a minimum of 70 percent minimum majority support from the Division I coaches. Unfortunately, this proposal is before you without our Division I head coaches having been able to voice their opinion.

However, we do believe this proposal has some merit and would like the opportunity, although it's very late, to discuss these merits at our membership vote during the 2008 national convention. We greatly appreciate the support of the conferences that reinforce our new WBCA legislative process for women's basketball-specific proposals to be discussed by the women's basketball community before they are submitted into the NCAA legislative cycle.

I hope this is a rare occurrence for me to be standing before you to decide on a women's basketball-specific proposal. We thank you for your time and your vote to send this proposal out for comment.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. D'Antonio: Thank you very much. Are there any additional comments on any of the proposals that are in the Official Notice?

We have a couple of small items before we conclude. First of all, I wish to inform the membership that at the Management Council meeting tomorrow, the Big East Conference will make a motion to withdraw Proposal 2007-46, which deals with instant messages.

In addition to that, I would like to thank Leeland Zeller, who is in a Wizard of Oz position over in the corner. He is the man making the proposals appear on the screen. Thank you, Leeland.

I would like to thank John, our stenographer, the people who helped us with the AV here today, as well as Vickie and Stephanie Schultz, who assisted us today in the setups at today's forum.

Please be reminded the override vote session will begin at 2 o'clock. In order to participate in the override vote session, you need both the smart card and a keypad.

Thank you very much for your attention today. Have a great Convention.

[The Division I Forum was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.]

DIVISION I BUSINESS SESSION

JANUARY 12, 2008

The Division I business session was called to order at 2 p.m. by Board of Directors Chair James Barker, Clemson University.

OPENING REMARKS

James Barker (Clemson University): Let me welcome all of you to the Division I business session. My name is Jim Barker. I have the pleasure of serving my alma mater, Clemson University, as president and serving as chair of the Board of Directors.

I would like to start this meeting with a few preliminary comments, and some clarification. We have some technological challenges in front of us. So in this voting process, I want to make sure we wrote this well and we have all of your questions answered.

We have on the dais this afternoon Jackie Campbell, who is the associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference and serves as chair of the Division I Management Council. We have also on the dais Damon Evans, director of athletics, University of Georgia, and vice chair of the Management Council. In addition we have NCAA staff with us: David Berst, Beth DeBauche, Lynn Holzman and Steve Mallonee.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

Please understand that this is the only business session for Division I. Therefore, a motion to reconsider a prior vote would have to be made before the conclusion of this business session. It would have to be made by a delegate on the prevailing side of a final vote on the matter to be discussed. I will outline procedures we will use for considering our three proposals today, Nos. 2006-40, 2006-87 and 2007-9. They can be found on Pages 1 through 9 of the 2008 Division I Official Notice and in the handout at your seats.

To begin, I will recognize the speaker at one of the numbered microphones who wishes to offer the base motion to override the Board of Directors' action to adopt Proposal 2006-40. I will then ask for a second. I will open the discussion on the motion and we will call on those who approach the microphone. Once the chair is satisfied that the discussion has concluded or that no one is bringing new information, I will announce that it is time to vote.

Please remember that a "yes" vote would support the motion to override the Board, and a "no" vote would support the Board of Directors' action to adopt the proposal. The abstentions count in the determination of a quorum only and not in the compilation of a majority vote. A successful override of the Board of Directors, therefore, requires a five-eighths majority, or 62.5 percent of the yes votes among the total of yes and nays.

The Division I institutions and conference members who qualify on the vote in the governance structure are eligible to cast a vote. If you intend to participate in the discussion of the initial motion regarding 2006-40, I invite you to take up one of the stations at our several microphones.

Are there any questions? Hearing none, with these comments and clarification, I would like now to call our business session to order.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

We will first consider an override of the adoption of Proposal 2006-40. I will recognize anyone for making of that motion. If we do not have a motion to override the Board, we will move on.

I want to make sure we give everyone plenty of time. Okay. We will now go to the next question.

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — NUMBER OF DATES OF COMPETITION
— MAXIMUM LIMITATIONS — GOLF**

We will now entertain a motion to override Proposal 2006-87.

Richard Fullerton (U.S. Air Force Academy): I move to override Proposal 2006-87, primarily because my compliance director told me this is what I am doing.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Barker: Is there any discussion? Are we prepared to vote? Please note that we are voting on the motion to override the Board's adoption of Proposal 2006-87.

[Proposal No. 2006-87 was approved, 190-95-19.]

It appears that the override vote passes and we will return to the original legislation.

**FINANCIAL AID AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL
GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT — SQUAD SIZE LIMITATION — BASEBALL**

We will now entertain a motion to override adoption of Proposal No. 2007-9.

Jack Evans (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I move to override Proposal No. 2007-9.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Barker: Please note that a delegate previously requested that the override on this vote be divided so the override paragraphs A and B can be voted on separately. Under NCAA adopted policy, the chair has acted to divide this for voting purposes, and we will first discuss and vote on Paragraph A and then turn to consideration of Paragraph B. Is there any discussion concerning the override of Paragraph A only at this time?

Walter Harrison (University of Hartford): I am chair of the Committee on Academic Performance, and from 2002 to 2007, I was a member of the Board of Directors. I am prepared to speak against override of the proposal. Are you prepared for that now?

Mr. Barker: If it has to do with Paragraph A, yes.

Mr. Harrison: Yes, sir. I want to remind the delegates that Proposal 2007-9 was one of a series of proposals adopted by the Board of Directors in 2007 specifically to address low graduation rates and poor academic performance rates in the sport of baseball.

It is important to understand that baseball is not performing well academically. It was adopted after a year-long study and report submitted to the Board by the Baseball Academic Enhancement Working Group. This Board-appointed group, which included me, another president, athletics directors, faculty, commissioners, head baseball coaches, senior woman administrators and others, was charged by the Board to offer a comprehensive plan to enhance academic performance in the sport. While only one of the four recommended proposals is subject to an override vote today, I want to emphasize that the entire package of legislation was adopted and was intended to work in concert.

The Board of Directors takes its role in leading the academic reform movement seriously and requests your support in maintaining the complete legislative package that is scheduled to become effective in baseball in the fall of 2008.

Two years ago, the Board was poised to reduce the number of games in the sport of baseball, in part due to this poor academic performance.

We were persuaded to let a study group evaluate whether other measures might be more helpful in causing change, and we charged that group with the development of a comprehensive plan to address the problem.

Proposal 2007-9 was one of the four elements of that plan, as I mentioned earlier. The others are fall term certification, elimination of time-work transfer exceptions in that sport, and increased APR penalties. The Board adopted this as a package and does not believe that it should be disassembled by overriding any portion of 2007-9. On behalf of the Board and on behalf of those of us who worked so long and hard on the Baseball Academic Enhancement Group and on behalf of the Committee on Academic Performance, I urge you to support the Board of Directors' position and vote "no" on this override.

Michael Adams (University of Georgia): I currently serve as chair of the Executive Committee.

Just to reiterate even a little bit further what Dr. Harrison has just said, I would submit to you that this is one of those occasions where the system has actually worked.

Poised is too mild a word. The Board was ready to reduce the number of games on the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Progress.

During the discussion, I received a phone call from a Division I AD, a former baseball coach, asking us to please withhold any action until the group that Dr. Harrison described, could be put together. We agreed to do that.

They brought a proposal to us as a Board and asked us to accept or reject it in total, do not piecemeal it. We accepted that recommendation from the committee and approved it as a whole. At that point, it included a 33-percent requirement on scholarship evaluation. Just as we were ready to endorse that, the committee came back and said please reduce that to 25 percent. We said okay. We don't have any argument with the committee.

We wanted to accept the recommendations from the people who are closest to this than the Board.

Once again, the Board acquiesced to the committee. So this is one of those occasions where I believe with all due respect the Board had listened to the duly appointed process. It has functioned well.

The first part of this, which relates to the number of agreed-upon scholarships, deserves to be sustained and the valuation of a scholarship, which is meaningful to a student-athlete and does not allow someone to be treated just on a scholarship as something basically on a quasi-tryout process, which is what we have been having in baseball.

That in many ways has contributed to their low academic performance. I would respectfully ask you to sustain the Board in this position. First of all, because it is right academically, and secondly, because the process that this group put in place about 10 years ago has been assiduously followed in this case.

I think that the end result is one that is representative to the kind of listening and sharing that needs to take place between the presidents, the athletics directors and the coaches.

Stephen Dennis (Troy University): I will make a few comments from the other side of the fence.

Our institution applauds what the Board of Directors did to achieve academic excellence in baseball as well as all of our sports.

We are committed and devoted to supporting the solutions and issues that create retention and academic success for our student-athletes. However, Troy University feels it is prudent to override this portion of baseball legislation.

Consider a few points as we take on this issue. We feel that the cap on the number of other players — I know I am skipping here a little bit — restricts opportunity for student-athletes who want to attend our institution to compete and earn a degree.

Our baseball program has 51 student-athletes on its roster and a 3.01 grade-point average as of the last semester, and an APR of 43. If this legislation is approved, it will eliminate 16 players who would be potential future supporters and financially impact the institution, which will suffer for not having those students enrolled in our school. That comes to about \$200,000.

We have been successful at Troy in management of scholarship resources and academic integrity by providing opportunities for as many student-athletes as possible.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Less government is best government."

We feel the issue of financial aid and the number of student-athletes that are on a team is best managed by the institution and it can directly lead to an academically strong and a highly competitive squad.

Once again, I thank the Board for the commitment to academic excellence. Troy University supports the goal to educate and graduate all student-athletes. This is a small part of an outstanding amount of work that has been done by so many of our presidents. There have been a lot of great strides that have been made with this legislation. It is our feeling, however, that capping is different for different institutions.

We have the ability and we have shown it is a great opportunity for our institution to really have more people involved in our family. So, we would ask that you consider overriding the two little sections of the proposal.

Ron Wellman (Wake Forest University): I am a member of the Baseball Academic Enhancement Working Group. I rise to ask you to defeat the override proposal. Drs. Adams and Harrison have eloquently reviewed the proposal with you and both of them stated that the Board of Directors was very cooperative with the working group. I want to reiterate that fact to you. The process has worked beautifully.

The working group brought this legislation to the Board of Directors. They did accept our proposal in total. We told them the core components of the legislation were strongly linked. The components that we are reviewing today, the 25-percent minimum scholarship, is strongly linked with the transfer rule.

As you well know, we are proposing, and it has been accepted, that the transfer rule be eliminated. The one-time exception will be eliminated for baseball players — if they would decide to transfer — so they would be required to have a year of residency at the institution. To have that expectation of baseball players when they are on a minimal amount of aid seems unfair. We can cite example after example to you of baseball players on a book scholarship. That could range from less than one percent to maybe three or four percent. To ask them to make that type of commitment to the institution without the institution making a reciprocal commitment to the baseball player seems very, very unfair to our committee, and we believe it is a student-athlete welfare issue.

Finally, I would like to review a survey that the American Baseball Coaches Association conducted a couple of months ago. Of the Division I coaches, 86 percent of them returned this survey. Part of the survey asked about this particular legislation. It was interesting to note that certification was supported by our baseball coaches. Fifty-four percent of them supported that. The maximum number of baseball players receiving aid, 49 percent of the baseball coaches supported that, but they recognized that the reason that only 49 percent supported it was because most of them wanted to have the limitation at 30, which it will be this year rather than 27, which it will be in 2009.

So, the majority of them support limitation, but they would like to see the number at 30 rather than 27. Seventy-six percent of the baseball coaches supported the maximum roster limit of 35. That was a surprise, quite frankly, because the number of baseball rosters now include 40. There are some baseball rosters that actually have 50 players on it.

The new transfer rule was supported by 76 percent of the baseball coaches. As for the penalties that would be adopted through this legislation, 70 percent of baseball coaches accepted that. The one piece of the legislation that a minority of baseball coaches supported was a 25-percent scholarship limit. We were surprised that 43 percent of the baseball coaches supported the minimum scholarship at 25 percent. When we asked the follow-up question of what you would like to see as a minimum amount of scholarship, we found that 84 percent of the baseball coaches wanted some type of minimum established.

They didn't necessarily agree with 25 percent, but they wanted something established rather than the nothing that we currently have today. So 84 percent of the baseball coaches do want some type of minimum scholarship established for their sport. I encourage you to defeat this override.

Larry Templeton (Mississippi State University): I am the chair of the Division I Baseball Committee, the chair of the Division I NCAA Baseball Issues Committee and a member of the Academic Enhancement Working Group.

In the spirit of understanding that we had a serious problem in college baseball with our young men not performing academically and with the Board giving us an opportunity not to cut games, there was a great deal of compromise that came together to put this package before you. I think Ron did a great job of sharing some of the statistics.

The baseball community had a problem. We spent a great deal of time working on a proposal to present to the Board. This organization came back and asked for some relief on the 33 percent, and it came to 25. Is 25 or 33 the magic number?

We are not asking you to be sure. But this group, in the spirit of compromise of doing what is best academically for the sport of baseball, arrived at the total package, and both the issues committee and the baseball committee would like to endorse standing behind the presidents' decision of adopting the entire package.

Jack Evans (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): As a footnote, I would observe that we have a baseball program that has enjoyed both academic and competitive success, and it is not a baseball program that is engaged in this practice of using large squad sizes for the purpose of trying out players.

I find myself in the awkward position of being modestly in opposition to the positions taken by two people for whom I have enormous respect and with whom I work.

President Harrison chairs the Committee on Academic Performance on which I serve.

Ron Wellman chaired the Baseball Academic Group on which I also served, and I believe those two people have done and are doing an excellent job in promoting what we need in the way of academic reform generally in the NCAA and in baseball in particular. I support all of these efforts.

I am also sensitive to the point made by President Adams regarding the fact that the Board of Directors listened to the membership in their work on this proposition. I would only submit modestly that the opportunity to consider an override is also an important part of the process provided to NCAA members. So we are grateful for this opportunity to have the floor briefly.

President Harrison described accurately the four key components of the baseball proposal. They include the removal of the one-time transfer exception, fall certification, enhanced penalties for particularly low-scoring baseball squads and the portion of the proposition that we are considering today.

Our concern with one part of the proposition that we are considering today is the 25-percent required minimum financial aid. That is there, as President Harrison indicated and as Ron Wellman indicated in part, not because it is directly connected to academic performance, but because it is an offset in some way to removal of the one-time transfer exception.

Our institution's concern with that component of the package is that it is not directly connected to improving academic performance. It is not that we oppose providing an offset for the student-athletes. We believe that is a good idea in this situation where something they previously had has been removed.

Our proposition is simply this: We can do better with alternative legislation for that piece of the proposal.

Consider for just a moment the following possible scenario.

Suppose Part A of this proposition is overridden, but Part B is not.

Part B, as you know, includes a 35 limit on the overall plus side. So if Part A was overridden and B sustained, that would leave a de facto limit of 35, not just on the squad size, but on the number of people who could receive aid.

If you do the basic arithmetic, an equivalent of 11.7 grants-in-aid are available to baseball spread over 35 players.

I am not arguing that any coach would ever do it that way, but if you just do that arithmetic to get insight as to what that implies, that would be slightly more than one-third of a grant-in-aid for each of those 35 players that would be available even though it does not have to be administered that way.

Our concern is that imposing the regulation on a baseball coach to require every grant-in-aid or every fractional equivalency to be at least 25 percent restricts that coach's ability to recruit.

That could very well have implications for competitive balance that probably have not been adequately considered. We think it is possible to do better and we would simply prefer to override that segment of this proposition now and permit alternative legislation to be submitted in the next legislative cycle. That point would clearly not be in order at this time. That is why we invite your consideration and override of Part A on Proposition 2007-9.

Anna Chappel: (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am the current chair of the Division I SAAC. We had a thorough discussion about this and we are split on this issue. The students feel there is a need for further consideration, discussion and a look at the needs of student-athletes when it comes to their academic success as well as their opportunities. We encourage you as well to continue this conversation. We're grateful for the work of the Academic Performance Working Group in baseball and the leadership of Ron Wellman.

Mr. Barker: It appears that we are ready to vote. Please note that we are voting on the motion to override the Board of Directors' action to adopt Paragraph A of Proposal No. 2007-9, which deals with financial aid.

[Proposal No. 2007-9-a was defeated, 87-200-21.]

Now we'll discuss the override of Paragraph B. Does anyone wish to speak to the second part of this motion, Paragraph B? I see no one rising to speak. It appears that we are ready to vote. Please note that we are voting on the motion to override the Board of Directors' action to adopt Paragraph B of the proposal, which is 2007-9 and deals with squad limits.

[Proposal No. 2007-9-b was defeated, 69-213-23.]

RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

Amy Thorne (University of Texas at Austin): I would like to move that we vote on Proposal 2006-40.
[The motion was seconded.]

Kathy Keene (Sun Belt Conference): I am the incoming chair of the Division I SAAC. I am here to speak on behalf of Division I SAAC and the Division I student-athletes to continued opposition of the override of Proposal 2006-40.

Our opposition to the text message dilemma has centered on the three key points over the past two years. First, we believe the intrusive nature of this form of communication places unnecessary demands on the prospects and their parents.

In an article in the Chicago Sun Times in April 2007, the author had the following to say: “We should not be treating kids with grown-up society gushing all over them. Coaches should not have the constant access to student kids as text messaging allows.” Therein lies the problems with the text messaging dilemma, the fact that these coaches have this unlimited access to prospects.

Second, we believe that text messaging places an undue cost burden on prospects and their families.

Several news stories I have heard over the past cite numerous instances where athletes have racked up phone bills of over several hundred dollars in one billing cycle due to this form of communication.

Finally, we believe that text messaging and instant messaging are highly unprofessional when used in the recruiting process. For example, you wouldn’t use text messaging to contact a potential employer when searching for a job, and the employer would not use that to contact you to offer you that job.

Although these may be the hippest forms of communication in today’s world, it takes the human element out of the recruiting process. A recruiting process without text messaging is a valuable tool that allows you to cultivate the skills necessary to be an effective communicator.

Anybody who has played sports knows it is an integral part of the student and the athlete. A typical text message is 106 characters, including the spaces between words, which does not allow meaningful conversation to exist.

The student-athlete is going to potentially spend the next four years of his or her life at the institution. It is imperative that the coaches and prospects take every step necessary to make sure that they are a good fit. Text messages do not allow this.

It is now been over five months since Proposal 2006 went into effect, and I am afraid some say the recruiting process has been solved. It is our hope that you will please join the Division I SAAC and the Division I student-athletes at large to continued opposition to the override of Proposal 2006-40.

Mr. Barker: Is there any further discussion? Seeing no one at the microphones, please note we are voting on the motion to override the Board of Directors’ action to adopt Proposal No. 2006-40.

[Proposal No. 2006-40 was defeated, 65-240-1.]

Is there any other business to come before us?

This business session is now adjourned. Thank you very much.

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 3 p.m.]

DIVISION II BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008

The Division II business session was called to order at 8:02 a.m. by Division II Presidents Council Chair Chuck Ambrose, Pfeiffer University.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Ambrose: Good morning, everyone. The 2008 Division II business session will now come to order. I'm Chuck Ambrose, president of Pfeiffer University and chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

As we begin today's business session, I would like for the other officers of the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council to stand and be recognized as I introduce you: the vice chair of the Presidents Council is Dr. Eddie Moore from Virginia State University; the Management Council chair is Roberta Page, director of athletics from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania; our Management Council vice chair is David Riggins, director of athletics from Mars Hill College. Please join me in thanking them for their time and energy.

I would also like to take this opportunity to introduce Larry Fitzgerald, former faculty athletics representative of Southern Connecticut State University, who will serve as our Division II parliamentarian.

Additionally, members of the membership services staff are with us. They are here to assist us with legislative questions and issues that may come up during the course of this year's business session.

We want to thank all of you for your participation in this Convention and business session.

Before we begin, I'd like to take a few minutes to allow for some celebration. There are several individuals who have joined us who are going to help us chart the course of the journey that we've been on.

Division II ... a commitment to academic success, a commitment to a high level of athletics competition in a personal setting where our student-athletes and others on our campus engage in ways that takes that and helps build community. It's the cumulative effect of all that that brings it together and puts students in a more likely position to graduate, but more importantly, gives them the life skills and abilities for where they go, who they are and what they become.

That's who we say we are. Division II is a destination, aligning our principles and our values with who we say we are. More importantly, the sense of value that we have together gives you as members a sense of being a part of Division II.

This platform was borne out of leadership and dedication that Dr. Myles Brand has provided to the NCAA — a collegiate model of intercollegiate athletics that calls us together to discuss athletics as a higher education association.

It's because of that leadership and support that we've been provided an "A Team" of resources, encouragement and affirmation to embark on this journey. Myles is with us this morning.

We're very appreciative of your engagement and support, and we look forward to your comments as we begin this business session.

Let's welcome Myles Brand.

Myles Brand (NCAA President): Thank you, Chuck.

It's a great pleasure being with you. As I was walking in here from the rest of this huge hotel, I was just taken aback.

Someone mentioned to me, "You're entering DII world." The fact of the matter is, it feels different. You've gone through an amazing journey; my compliments to you for having done that.

It was only about two years ago when there was a meeting in Orlando of the university presidents. I hope they don't take offense when I say it was a whiney meeting. People were unclear who they were and why they were there. There were lots of questions. "How do you get into DI?" The fact of the matter, it was not a good environment. But they took the bull by the horns, so to speak, and said, "We're going to manage our own future. We're going to change," and went to work.

Last year, the same group of people met in San Diego. It was a celebration. Within one year, the change that took place was nothing short of phenomenal. It's not merely "feel good," which it is. It's a change of direction. It's an understanding of who you are, where you're going and why. It's a change of understanding the role you have to play in the education of young people. It's an emphasis on the quality of these great institutions that make up DII.

It was really a remarkable change. I sincerely want to compliment the leadership and the entire division for—I'm serious now—leading the way for the NCAA.

You guys have just done a terrific job, making it clear to yourselves, the rest of the NCAA, and frankly, the world, what the NCAA can and should be. So, my hat's off to you. Congratulations on a great job.

I want to call attention to some of the presidential leaders. In doing so, I think it's important to recognize their efforts and successes. But at the same time, I want us to recognize that there are many of us out there, especially among the presidents, who really deserve credit, along with our Management Council and athletics personnel and athletics administrators, everyone. But I do want to call attention to three people, because they really helped lead the way and had the vision and the energy to make it happen.

First was George Hagerty, and second was Kathryn Martin, and now Charles Ambrose. Would you help me recognize those three important people? (Applause)

It's action. It's not just words. It's not just symbols and slogans. It's change that has taken place for the better.

I continue to be an advocate for the sports festival. I think that's a signature event for Division II. You're moving toward doing it more often and regularly in each season. I think it's terrific for the student-athletes. It's a great opportunity to showcase Division II. It attracts media attention and it attracts local attention. I think it's a great symbol and opportunity for our student-athletes to be in the forefront.

This strategic positioning platform is your road map. I think you got it exactly right. I especially want to compliment you on your community engagement efforts.

When I gave my talk to the Association just a day or two ago, I wanted to emphasize the role of athletics in community development, both on campus and beyond the campus itself. Division II has taken that to heart. In fact, some of my comments just built off your successes and your thinking on this. I think that's incredible.

Student-athletes have been an important part of the community engagement activity. Some of our student-athletes from Division II are helping to build a house right here in this building, and will put it in a box and ship it somewhere. But the fact of the matter is, they are, through their volunteer efforts, making a difference.

In a moment you'll hear about the Make-A-Wish opportunities as well. Again, it's the student-athlete drive and student-athlete effort that really shows that they take it to heart, not just the words, but the actions of how to make a difference in people's lives.

But good enough is never good enough, and there are always challenges. There are always things we could do better, no matter how successful we are. Those in athletics know better than anyone else that winning today means tomorrow is another challenge. I think we have to find out what those challenges are and continue to rise to the occasion to meet them. I think there are a couple of challenges for Division II, as well as for the rest of the NCAA that I want to bring to your attention.

One is, as you know and as Chuck has been emphasizing as well, I'm strongly committed to the collegiate model in which we are different from professional sports, in that those who participate in our games are students and students first. That matters. We want to make sure that our student-athletes have every opportunity to take advantage of the fine education given at our universities and colleges. For that reason, they have to come in well prepared for the kind of academic work that takes place on campus.

We know from research over many years what it takes to be successful in college. The single most important factor of success in college that our longitudinal studies have shown time and again is how important high school preparation is, particularly in core academic courses.

The academic course number and quality of course work in high school really establishes a student very early on in his or her career in college. I know as you work through your own academic reform efforts on the docket, there is an increase in the number of core academic courses. I think that is an important step forward, and I hope

you consider that seriously as you go forward.

Another issue that is clearly very important, not just for Division II but across all divisions, is sportsmanship. Sportsmanship is all about respect — respect for one's self, one's teammates and competitors, and respect for the game and the institution. Sportsmanship is at the heart of what we do. Winning is important. Let's not be naive about it. Winning is very important. But the fact of the matter, it isn't only about winning. It's also about what you gain from the game and how you play it.

I know that's an old, perhaps trite saying, but the fact of the matter is that how you play the game matters. Cheating is not acceptable. Sportsmanship shows respect. I think we need to in every way possible continue to emphasize that.

Finally, I want to continue to urge you on in your community engagement activities. You're right there in the forefront. You're leading the way. I understand that. Congratulations to you. But frankly, our universities and colleges have to continue to be part of our communities. We have a role and an obligation in the larger society beyond the campus. That means everyone in the athletics department as well as everyone in the university. It involves students and faculty, athletics administrators and coaches, and of course, presidents and academic administrators. But we need to continue to reach out. I want to count on your leadership, as we have seen evolve over the last several years, in community engagement.

So again, congratulations Division II. You're deserving of all the accolades. You've made a difference. You're continuing to make a difference. I always enjoy coming to meet with you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you very much, Dr. Brand. We appreciate you being with us, as well.

One of the great things I know we all appreciate on campus is when our students lead by example and make a difference. The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has shown us firsthand what our Division II attribute of service is all about. Our SAAC initially began its alliance with the Make-A-Wish Foundation in 2003-2004 when it raised more than \$48,000. We all thought that was phenomenal. Each year following, the SAAC has continued its commitment, raising more than \$80,000 in 2004-2005, more than \$118,000 in 2005-2006, and doubling its fund-raising goal of \$100,000 in 2006-2007 by raising more than \$208,000. For those who are counting, that is more than \$450,000 in support of Make-A-Wish over the last four years. In many different ways, that has engaged people in a sense of togetherness. That's quite an accomplishment.

The Division II SAAC has developed a Division II public service announcement related to this important partnership, and we want to share that with you right now.

[The delegates watched the public service audiovisual.]

As many of you know, the Make-A-Wish Foundation grants the wishes of children with life-threatening medical conditions to enrich the human experience with hope, strength and joy. Make-A-Wish is the largest wish-granting charity in the world, with 76 chapters in the U.S. and its territories and 27 international affiliates on five continents. The Make-A-Wish Foundation has granted more 110,000 wishes to children around the world since 1980.

A child's wish can fall into four categories: I wish to go; I wish to meet; I wish to have; and I wish to be. Every effort is made to include immediate family to create a wish experience for the child that will last a lifetime.

With all this in mind, it is my extreme pleasure and honor to introduce to you two very special people, both very closely connected to Make-A-Wish.

Carey Demos is the vice chair of the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and has been actively involved in Make-A-Wish since being appointed to the committee.

David Williams is the president and chief executive officer of the Make-A-Wish Foundation, joining the organization in January 2005. He has been involved in the nonprofit sector providing leadership to the Houston Food Bank and Habitat for Humanity for more than 20 years. The most important thing we'd like to tell you about David this morning is that he holds a bachelor's degree from a Division II institution and is a former student-athlete of Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania.

Please join me in welcoming Carey Demos and David Williams.

Carey Demos (Northeast-10 Conference): Good morning. It is my complete honor to stand before you on

behalf of every single Division II student-athlete from your institutions.

At this time, I would like to present a check in the amount of \$208,000 to the Make-A-Wish Foundation.

Mr. David Williams: Thank you, Carey. Thank you, Chuck.

It is hard to believe that it was 30 years ago that I was playing tennis at Bloomsburg State College. It was a state college then. I guess there are a few people here from the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

But as I've told many people over the years, I learned a tremendous amount competing back then, so many things that have helped me since then. I learned about teamwork, learned about perseverance and learned about trying to take my game to the next level.

I've often said to people that I'm fond of hiring athletes in the organizations that I've worked in. You might say, "Well, sure, you want people who are competitive and know how to win."

Actually, it's because I find that being around people who know how to lose is someone who you want to have on your team because, frankly, anybody who has ever competed, especially at a collegiate level, no matter how successful they are, know something about losing.

The reality is that every day we get up and we do our best, and sometimes we succeed and sometimes we don't. Athletes know that when you do lose, the great ones will take a step back, dust themselves off, and go at it again tomorrow. Those are the kind of people who you want to have on any team.

Just like competition helps student-athletes, I think partnerships like the one with the Make-A-Wish Foundation help them. I think they help them in three ways.

No. 1. It reminds them that they are not the only people in the world. Sometimes we all need to be reminded about that. But often we live in a world where it's all about ourselves. It's a reminder that there are other people out there.

No. 2. It's a reminder that those other people who are out there, that many of them are hurting. You heard the statistic of how many wishes we've granted. Every year, we grant 13,000 wishes. That's a wish every 41 minutes. Yet, there are 27,000 children who are diagnosed every year with a life-threatening medical condition. So for every child that we're helping, there's another out there that we are not.

But there are an awful lot of kids who wake up one day, and because they have had a headache or something has been bothering them, they go to a hospital, and all of a sudden they receive a diagnosis that changes their life. Instead of worrying about grades and how to do well on their team, now all of a sudden their world is a world of radiation and chemotherapy and doctors and hospitals.

Finally, I think the third benefit of partnerships like this is that there's a realization that you can make a difference; that you don't have to be a CEO of a Fortune 500 company to make a difference. You can be a college student and you can have car washes or raffles or whatever it takes to be able to raise money to be able to help an organization.

I'd like to close with a letter that I received a couple weeks ago during the holiday season. We fortunately receive many wonderful letters, many wonderful signs of support. But I thought this one was interesting because it was from a dad whose daughter received a wish, but what caught my attention is when that wish was received.

"The purpose of this letter to say thank you again after 17 years for the wish you gave my daughter, Ashley, when she was sick with leukemia. I just wanted to let you know after all these years, how much I appreciated, and still appreciate, what you did for her and my family. Let me give you some old and recent history of our family.

"Ashley was diagnosed when we lived in New Jersey. She was diagnosed with cancer when she was only 4½-years-old. We had just moved to Jersey to work with my father-in-law's construction company. But after two years of treatment, we moved back to Rochester. When we came back home, my wife and I basically started over again.

"Ashley completed her treatment in the next two years at Strong Memorial Hospital. During that time, your agency contacted us for a trip to Florida. I will always remember the special treatment and kindness that we felt during that whole experience. Even though we ended up in the Orlando hospital the day of her birthday due to a fever, we received support and kindness from everyone. It was a great trip with so many good memories.

"Now let me catch you up after all these years. My son, who is a year younger than Ashley, is in film school

in Los Angeles pursuing his dreams. My wife is a major gift officer at the same hospital that treated Ashley when she was sick.

“I’m an assistant principal at a local middle school, and during two weeks over the summer for the last 12 years I’m the director of Camp Open Arms. It’s a day camp that provides kids battling life-threatening diseases and their sibling activities to make some friends and enjoy themselves.

“Ashley is completing her last year of college. She will be a child life specialist and plans to work in a hospital, working with other families going through similar treatments. She’s a beautiful young lady who has a heart of gold. It’s always been her wish to be that person making a difference for those families dealing with the stress of a sick child.

“After all these years, I still look fondly on what you provided our family during an unbelievably stressful time. We made it and appreciate every day the gifts and blessings we have. I thank you so much for that experience 17 years ago, and truly believe some of these tough days were made easier, just having those memories.

“Words can’t express enough what it has meant to our family. But during this holiday season, I just wanted to share with you our story once again.”

That’s what you and your student-athletes make possible. I think that’s pretty amazing. On behalf of the Make-A-Wish Foundation, I want to simply thank you for your participation.

If your school is not involved, I would encourage you to do so. It’s not just because of the children and the moms and dads and brothers and sisters who will be impacted, but it’s because your students will be better people as a result of it as well.

I have something that is a small token of appreciation that I would like to give Carey. It’s a “thank you” for the contribution to the 2006-2007 Make-A-Wish Foundation fund-raiser to NCAA Division II.

Thank you. Thank you for your leadership, and thank you for your support.

Mr. Ambrose: Certainly, our national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has helped us live out our commitment to passion on our campuses. It’s something they believe.

We do have a tool for telling that story. It’s part of the growing documentation of where we are. We want to show you that before we start our business.

[Note: The delegates watched a Make-A-Wish video clip.]

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you, big and small, for what you do on your campuses to support your Student-Athlete Advisory Committees.

Now, let’s start our business. As is our custom, we need to take a few minutes to review the Division II voting process for the NCAA Convention.

Some votes will be done by paddle vote. A few proposals are designated for roll call where we use the voting units. Let me first remind you how to cast a vote using these particular voting units.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTS COUNCIL

Mr. Ambrose: Before we begin voting on proposals, I would like to call on Eddie Moore, who is vice chair of the Presidents Council and a member of the CIAA, to present the report of the Presidents Council.

Eddie, we appreciate your report this morning.

Eddie Moore (Virginia State University): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning. My name is Eddie N. Moore, Jr. I’m president of Virginia State University and vice chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

We have again this year produced a written version of the Management Council, the Presidents Council and the budget reports in the form of a yearbook. Each of you should have received a copy of this yearbook as part of your Division II conference registration.

As in the past, this year’s Convention yearbook contains important committee reports and information about Division II. This yearbook assists in conducting our business more efficiently by providing written reports instead of a series of committee speeches. It also provides you with important news that you can take back to your campuses. I encourage you to share this yearbook with staff members who were not able to attend today.

I would like to take a few minutes to highlight some of the information that's included in the 2007 yearbook. Starting at Page 10, you will find an updated summary of Division II facts, figures and a quick overview of the benefits of being a Division II member. For a more in-depth analysis of the Division II membership, I encourage you to read the 2006-2007 Membership Report that was mailed to your institution during the summer.

The Division II "Up Close and Personal" and "News at a Glance" sections begin at Pages 21 and 35, respectively. They highlight some of the accomplishments of Division II student-athletes and administrators during 2007. We all should be proud of what these individuals have been able to do as part of the Division II family.

The Division II strategic positioning initiative and its activation may be found on Pages 44 through 47. Under the leadership of the Division II Presidents Council, the division has implemented a strategic positioning platform that is at the core of all we do in Division II. Over the last year, we have seen the activation of this platform on the local level through the use of the activation tool kit, purchasing Web site and a community enhancement Web site. These initiatives have moved Division II from a regulatory environment to a strategic-initiative environment.

The next sections relate to the 2007 Presidents Council, Management Council and committee reports of the Division II governance structure.

These reports deliver information regarding the initiatives undertaken by each group. I encourage you to read all of the reports and contact your committee chair or staff liaisons if you have any questions or concerns.

Pages 68 through 85 of the yearbook cover information regarding Division II championships, the SAAC's Make-A-Wish partnership and the CSTV partnership.

Moreover, please read the Division II budget information set forth on Pages 88 through 92.

The Division II budget principles implemented in the past few years have led to significant surpluses, and these unallocated funds have been re-allocated to the championship enhancements of the past few years. We also provided a one-time supplement distribution to each of the Division II institutions this past year.

The accomplishments in 2007 were significant for Division II, and we anticipate more good news for next year. For a look at the division's 2008 priorities, please refer to Page 99.

I hope that this yearbook continues to be a useful tool for all of you. Time has been set aside at the conclusion of our legislative business today for questions, comments or any concerns you may have about the yearbook.

I hope you will use this to enhance your knowledge of the Division II governance structure.

Mr. Chair, that concludes the president's report for the 2008 Convention.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you, Eddie.

Please join me in thanking Dr. Eddie Moore. (Applause)

In addition to the growing array of tools that we have available, for the "I Chose Division II" theme, we have one new piece of that tool kit that is available to us today.

[Note: The delegates watched the new audiovisual.]

As we look at all of our video assets, this has not happened without a very important partnership between Division II and an organization called Creative Street.

We got very excited with Creative Street when last summer they were recognized with an Emmy on a documentary for the work of nurses in Vietnam.

Joining us today in the back of the room are David Williams and Steve Katzenberger.

If you guys would stand up.

The exciting news for Division II is our "I Chose Division II" was recognized by their industry with a CINE Golden Eagle Award. We share that recognition because we appreciate the quality of your work. If you would, let's show them our appreciation. (Applause)

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

Before we start our voting this morning, Robert's Rules of Order provide that the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice.

In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendixes in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite our work as delegates. I will not take time to explain all the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout our business session this morning.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. Let me briefly review those with you.

We will use the voting machines for roll-call votes. All other votes will be handled by paddle. Roll-call votes were designated by the Presidents Council for those proposals where it appears important to create a historical record on how each Division II school voted on the issue.

We will attempt from the podium to eyeball as many paddle votes as possible, calling for a machine count only when the vote appears to be too close to call. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for an electronic vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue.

If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks.

The microphone numbers will be used to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to no single motion more than twice. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in Appendix J, which is in the back of your Official Notice on Page 111.

I would ask that you identify yourself by name and your institution or affiliation whenever you address the Convention. The delegates wearing Convention badges that are red, purple or green are permitted to speak. Those with other colors are visitors and may not participate other than as observers.

As a reminder, the speeches made during today's business session for each proposal create a historical record that becomes important for research regarding the legislative intent of our 2008 voting delegates. The annual Convention Proceedings will serve as the official record of the business session, and your remarks will be included in the Proceedings.

Let me also review briefly the window of reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the consideration of the 21 Division II proposals, we will pause for approximately five minutes for people to organize for the period of reconsideration. I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on. We ask that all motions to reconsider occur during this window of reconsideration.

Also, please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates for implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If an immediate effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will then be August 1, 2008.

We have a court reporter to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I would remind you again to identify yourself, your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

Let me also call to your attention two Convention publications. The first is the Convention Program that you received at registration. The second publication I want to mention is the 2008 NCAA Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November.

In Appendix A, the blue pages in the Official Notice, Pages 41 through 42, you will find a list of the 21 legislative proposals that will be considered during this Division II business session.

I would also like to call your attention to the procedural issues memo, the green sheet, handed out to you this morning. This memo highlights procedural issues related to the division's legislative proposals.

We will attempt to complete our business this morning. If we have not completed our voting in the morning, we will recess around 12:30 for lunch. If we have more business after lunch, we will reconvene at 1 p.m.

Our first action this morning is to approve the Official Notice and our Convention Program. If we vote to

accept the Official Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in these publications.

I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you will have approved the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix B, which is Pages 43 through 48; the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, Pages 49 through 82; and the intent-based amendments in Appendix D, Pages 83 through 85. These interpretations and amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council during the past 12 months, and we will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so.

I will now ask for someone to make a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work. After such a motion, we then can consider any motions to re-order proposals. Do I have such a motion?

I have a motion and a second.

It is now time for our paddle vote on the motion to adopt the Official Notice and printed program. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed please raise your paddles; abstentions. Thank you. The motion passes and we will proceed to our voting procedures.

We are now ready to start voting. This year, the Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals Nos. 1 and 2 as the consent package, and they are intended to be voted on as a group.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposal Nos. 3 through 10 as those that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chancellors and presidents, and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping this year.

After considering the Presidents Council groupings, we will then consider the rest of the legislation, beginning with Proposal No. 11 and continuing until we finish our work with Proposal No. 21.

We are now ready to begin our consideration of legislative proposals. We will start on Page No. 2 of the Official Notice, with consent package Proposals Nos. 1 and 2. They will be considered as a group unless there is an objection. Please refer to the green procedural issues document, Page No. 1, for the correction that should be made in the Official Notice to Proposal No. 2, Part A.

This is a paddle vote. The Management Council and Presidents Council have determined these proposals to be housekeeping in nature, and that is why they have been placed in the consent package. Both proposals have immediate effective dates; however, since they are part of the consent package, there will be no separate vote on the effective date for these two proposals unless someone moves to pull one of the proposals from the grouping.

CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT PACKAGE

Roberta Page (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposals 1 and 2 as the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

Each of these proposals was placed in the consent package because of the nature of the change being proposed. These two proposals are considered without controversy. Therefore, it is appropriate to vote on both proposals as a package.

[The consent package was approved.]

NCAA MEMBERSHIP — ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP — CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 3 is a roll-call vote with an immediate effective date. Therefore, there will be two votes on this proposal. The immediate effective date will be considered first by paddle vote. It needs two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the proposal, followed by a roll-call vote on the merits of the proposal.

Jim Johnson (Mid-American Intercollegiate Athletics Association): On behalf of the Division II Membership Committee, I move Proposal No. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

Additionally, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 3 has an immediate effective date to permit Canadian institutions to submit an application to begin the Division II membership process by the legislated deadline of June 1.

Karen Morse (Western Washington University): I support both aspects of this proposal. I'm representing the CEOs, the Management Council and the institutions. We support establishment of a pilot program to allow the Canadian institutions to join DII membership.

In the eastern part of the United States, there are 193 Division II schools. In the west there are 83. We need this proposal so that we can consider Canadian universities to maintain and enhance DII sports in the west, particularly in the northwest. This is a proposal that is very important to the viability of DII sports in the west. It would provide increased sports sponsorships. It would allow us to have more sports represented, including soccer, baseball, football and men's and women's golf.

Both of these points that I brought out embrace the DII model and philosophy. Our conference, the Great Northwest Athletic Conference, or GNAC, is prepared to help these schools. Academic requirements will have to be met.

I would urge the members of Division II to support this and to not hesitate or be afraid to vote for this because it does help the conference. We believe there will be sufficient examination of issues and safeguards, and that they will be assured. We urge your support of this agenda item. Thank you.

Chairman Ambrose: Does anyone have a comment on the immediate effective date? This is a vote on the immediate effective date only. Then we'll move on to the merits of the motion.

Are there any comments on the immediate effective date? If not, let's vote on the immediate effective date by paddle.

[The immediate effective date was approved.]

Mr. Johnson: I echo President Morse's encouragement to support this proposal.

Proposal No. 3 will establish a pilot program to study the feasibility of allowing Canadian institutions to join Division II.

This is a 10-year pilot program. The time line was established by the NCAA Executive Committee. The time line will allow the Division II Membership Committee to examine the issues involved with international membership and to assess the viability of Canadian institutions becoming active members of Division II.

Per the proposal, this is only enabling legislation. Throughout the pilot, the Membership Committee will establish policies and procedures to ensure that only those Canadian institutions that are aligned with our division's strategic positioning platform and strategic goals will be admitted into the membership process.

Proposal No. 3 provides us an outstanding opportunity for the division to expand its reach. For this reason, I strongly urge your support of Proposal No. 3.

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 3.

This proposal has the potential to be an avenue by which the division can increase its number of active institutions. The Executive Committee's intent with establishing a 10-year pilot program was to allow a division's governance structure to have ample time to address the logistical challenges inherent in our active members competing outside of the United States. The Division II Membership Committee intends to do that type of thorough study and review.

Although hurdles to permitting competition between an institution in Canada and an institution located in the United States exists, we owe it to our current active members, specifically those located in areas of the country where domestic competition may be lacking, to explore any and all areas of potential membership.

By adopting Proposal No. 3, the membership will not endorse Canadian membership, but will create a judicious and fair review of whether Canadian institutions should be permitted to enter the Association as active members in the division. This recommended change is in alignment with the division's strategic positioning platform and makes sense for the development of the division.

Proposal No. 3 is an opportunity for Division II to take a significant step forward in leading the Association into the future. Please join me in support of this proposal.

Heather Walker (Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference): I'm a Canadian citizen from the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference. I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 3.

Division II student-athletes support the concept of using a pilot program to establish the feasibility of Canadian membership. Their inclusion could offer a unique student-athlete experience, with benefits such as providing more playing opportunities and engaging in an international experience.

This study will also reveal the potential drawbacks of international Division II membership. Without this legislation, we will never know if these potential benefits outweigh the drawbacks.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Mr. Ambrose: We are now ready to vote on the merits of Proposal No. 3 by a roll-call vote.

[Proposal No. 3 was adopted, 258-9-2.]

RECRUITING — PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS AFTER NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT SIGNING OR OTHER WRITTEN COMMITMENT

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 4 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. Please refer to Page No. 2 of the green procedural issues document for the correction that should be made in the Official Notice.

Ann Martin (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 4. [The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 4 amends the recruiting legislation to specify that electronically transmitted correspondence is limited to electronic mail and faxes.

We all know that excessive use of certain forms of electronic communication permitted under current legislation has become very problematic to the point that prospective student-athletes are being bombarded by text messages and instant messages day and night.

In addition, many coaches use messages boards and social networking sites, such as Facebook and MySpace to interact with prospective student-athletes at any time.

This proposal seeks to reduce some of the problems that have been created with the overuse of these types of communications.

The proposal will, however, permit an institution with which a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission or financial aid to send other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence such as instant and text messaging.

If the proposal is adopted, this could be done the day after the prospective student-athlete has signed with the institution. This exception will permit flexibility for the institution to communicate with prospective student-athletes regarding important issues such as enrollment at the institution or eligibility center issues.

It is expected that Proposal No. 4 will reduce the burden in the recruiting process placed on coaches, prospective student-athletes and their parents that have been created with the overuse of text messaging and instant messaging, while at the same time the proposed recommended change will assist with the monitoring and the limiting of other forms of technology that may be created in the future that are similar to text and instant messaging.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): I represent the South Atlantic Conference on the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

When the Management Council reviewed this proposal, there was a lengthy discussion regarding this concept. Although there were differing opinions, the Council believed that the issue should ultimately be decided by the Division II membership during this business session.

However, the Management Council understands that by limiting electronically transmitted correspondence to e-mails and facsimiles, this proposal will make a direct impact on a prospective student-athlete's time. It is anticipated that the recommended change will significantly reduce the disruptions to prospective student-athletes currently caused by receiving text messages and instant messages at any time of the day.

In addition, coaches won't feel the pressure to contact student-athletes constantly via text messages or instant messages just because coaches from other institutions are doing so.

This proposal also creates potential financial savings for prospective student-athletes. As we all know, under current legislation, prospects and their parents are bearing the significant cost involved with receiving these text messages. By eliminating the use of text messages until the prospect has committed to an institution, these costs will be significantly reduced.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Carey Demos (Northeast-10 Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 4.

When selecting an institution, prospective student-athletes strive to find an athletics program with the values and personality that parallel their own. Using text messaging as a communication tool during this process does not help shine light on an institution or give any recruiting advantage to coaches who use texting. Student-athletes simply prefer a phone call or an e-mail.

Eliminating text messages until the National Letter of Intent is signed would reduce the financial burden placed on prospects. They will not have to financially accommodate unwanted, cumbersome and distracting text messages.

Lastly, Division II is anchored by its core principles and values. It should not jeopardize these principles to simply keep pace with technology. The student-athletes encourage you to support this legislation.

Joseph O'Brien (West Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

It is important to remember that this proposal does not entirely eliminate the use of other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence, such as text messaging, instant messaging and communicating through online message boards during the recruitment process.

As previously stated, this proposal will permit institutions to send text and instant messages to prospective student-athletes on the calendar day after a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or a written offer of admission or financial aid.

This exception is similar to the current legislated exception regarding unlimited telephone calls after a written commitment. By creating this exception, Proposal No. 4 will permit text and instant messaging and other forms of electronic communication between a coach and a prospective student-athlete after he or she signs a written commitment to attend the institution.

Once a relationship has been developed between a coach and a prospective student-athlete, less formal types of communication, including instant and text messaging, will be acceptable.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 4 was approved, 247-23.]

ELIGIBILITY — FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT — REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE OR COMPETITION — ELIGIBILITY FOR MALE STUDENTS OR MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES TO PRACTICE WITH WOMEN'S TEAMS — CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 5 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. There is also an amendment-to-amendment, Proposal No. 5-1. That will be considered by roll-call vote. Please refer to the green procedural issue document, Page No. 2, for the change in effective date for Proposal No. 5-1. Please refer to the green procedural issues document, Page No. 3, for the official interpretation approved by the Division II Management Council on Proposal No. 5.

Mark Linder (University of North Alabama): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Thomas Harden (Clayton State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 5-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 5-1 will eliminate the requirement that a male student who practices with an institution's women's team be certified for competition.

The current legislation requires male practice players to be certified for practice only when participating with an institution's women's team.

The certification requirements for all practice players, whether they are men or women, should be the same. As such, male students who practice with an institution's team should only be required to meet the certification requirements for practice, rather than meeting the certification requirements for both practice and competition.

For these reasons, the Presidents Council urges your support of the amendment-to-amendment of Proposal No. 5.

Mr. Ambrose: It is now time to decide Proposal No. 5-1 by roll-call vote.

[Proposal No. 5-1 was approved, 251-19.]

Now that the vote on 5-1 is complete, we must decide on the original motion regarding Proposal No. 5.

Mr. Linder: Proposal No. 5 is not a philosophical debate.

It doesn't have any bearing on your belief as to whether male practice players should be used or not.

To be more precise, this proposal is to clarify and simplify the certification process of these individuals. It will still be left to institutional discretion whether to use male practice players or not.

Proposal No. 5 will require male students who practice with women's teams to be certified in accordance with NCAA eligibility requirements for practice.

The current rules cause some confusion. There's two different certification processes: one if you use male practice players on an occasional basis; the other if you use them on a regular basis. We feel that this legislation will clarify and help compliance officers.

Proposal No. 5 will also permit male student-athletes in any sport to engage in practice sessions with a women's team at your institution. Once again, deciding whether to use a male student-athlete in practice is up to institutional discretion.

Therefore, the Legislation Committee urges you to strongly support this proposal.

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 5.

It is important to note again that Proposal No. 5 does not address the philosophical issues regarding the use of male students in practice sessions with an institution's women's team. That use is left to the institution's discretion.

Specifically, the proposal only attempts to address compliance-related issues surrounding male practice players.

Over the past couple of years, many concerns regarding the certification requirements for the use of male practice players have been raised by the membership. It is argued that many institutions are either unaware of the current rule regarding the use of male students who engage in practice sessions with the women's team or that the institutions know the rule but misapply it.

The current rule can be confusing. As previously stated, there are two certification requirements in place, depending on whether the male student is used on an occasional or a regular basis in practice sessions with a women's team.

The Division II Manual does not define these terms. Rather, institutions are left to make that determination which, in many cases, results in the misapplication of the rule.

Proposal No. 5 attempts to minimize confusion by creating one certification requirement for male practice players. In addition, this streamlined certification process is expected to assist compliance officers because there will be a universal certification requirement for all practice players.

Although the survey results regarding the use of male practice players in Division II show that institutions consistently use male students as practice players, compliance-related problems, as previously highlighted, need to be addressed.

Proposal No. 5 begins to address those problems by creating a more efficient way in which institutions will certify the eligibility of male practice players.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 5.

Eileen Patton (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 5.

Philosophical disagreements over the use of male practice players often arise because of different institutional policies. A uniform certification process among institutions will create a common ground from which student-athletes, coaches and administrators can begin to understand the effect male practice players have on female student-athletes.

Coaches will continue to use male practice players in the foreseeable future. As such, student-athletes want a clear, consistent process to identify and certify male practice players.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 5, as amended, was adopted, 237-27-3.]

ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS — ELIGIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL AID, PRACTICE AND COMPETITION — EARLY ACADEMIC CERTIFICATION

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 6 is a roll-call vote with an immediate effective date for those students first entering a collegiate institution full-time on or after August 1, 2008. Therefore, there will be two votes on this proposal. The immediate effective date will be considered first by paddle vote. It needs two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the proposal, followed by a roll-call vote on the merits of Proposal No. 6.

Thomas Harden (Clayton State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 6.
[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I also move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 6 has an immediate effective date for those students first entering a collegiate institution full-time on or after August 1, 2008.

This effective date will permit the NCAA Eligibility Center to begin certifying student-athletes under the early academic certification process this spring for all student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution for the 2008-09 academic year.

Mr. Ambrose: Are there any other comments on the immediate effective date? If not, it is now time for a paddle vote on the immediate effective date for Proposal No. 6.

[The immediate effective date for Proposal No. 6 was approved.]

Mr. Harden: The concept of certifying prospective student-athletes as a qualifier based on six semesters of high school course work and a standardized test score is consistent with how most institutions admit students in general. However, the initial-eligibility requirements currently do not have a similar provision.

Allowing early academic certification of a reasonably large percentage of prospective student-athletes will provide earlier notification of an individual's status and ease the administrative burden at the beginning of the academic year.

Early certification does not jeopardize the academic standards that have been established for incoming student-athletes. Research indicates that most prospective student-athletes who are granted early academic certification after six semesters would meet the existing initial-eligibility requirements to be declared a qualifier.

Further, individual institutions retain the opportunity to implement more stringent admission and eligibility requirements.

Therefore, it is expected that the permanent implementation of an early academic certification process will not compromise the intent of initial-eligibility requirements.

For these reasons and those previously stated, I would hope you will join me in supporting this proposal.

Ann Jirkovsky (Bellarmine University): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 6.

This proposal specifies that prospective student-athletes who satisfy specific academic requirements will be declared qualifiers based on six semesters of high school course work.

This proposal will make permanent a process that was used for students through a waiver process who first enrolled in a member institution for the current academic year.

After reviewing several potential models for early certification and the results of the waiver process, this recommended change is the most appropriate method for determining early qualifiers. The proposal makes academic sense.

Moreover, research indicates that the vast majority of prospective student-athletes who meet the requirements for early certification would satisfy the division's initial-eligibility standards to become a qualifier after the completion of high school.

Introducing an early certification opportunity will provide student-athletes and institutions with earlier notification of their eligibility status and reduce the number of certifications that are completed in the final days before the start of the fall sports season and the academic year.

For this reason and for the reasons previously stated, I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.
[Proposal No. 6 was approved, 268-1.]

ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS — CORE-COURSE UNITS

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 7 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2013, for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2013.

Stephen Jordan (Metropolitan State College of Denver): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 7 increases the number of core courses required for initial eligibility from 14 to 16.

The proposal specifies that the two additional core courses must include one unit of additional courses in English, mathematics or natural or physical science and one unit in any core area.

Based on research provided to the Presidents Council in regard to the core-course-taking behavior of student-athletes, it was discovered that the division's core-course requirements for initial eligibility do not align with the requirements for many states' high school graduation criteria and many Division II institutions' admission criteria.

As a higher education association, this is unacceptable. An increase to the core-course requirements for initial eligibility will align these three standards.

More importantly, the increased requirement will also better prepare our student-athletes for the rigors of academics during the first year of collegiate enrollment.

As you are all aware, Division II prides itself on emphasizing a comprehensive program of learning and development. During the first year of collegiate enrollment, student-athletes are learning how to juggle the stress of academics and athletics.

We increase the likelihood of student-athlete academic success during the first year by confirming that our student-athletes enter the first year well prepared to handle those stresses.

By increasing the number of required core courses for initial eligibility, it is one way that student-athletes can show they are prepared to handle the rigors of academics in college.

Although research indicates that the average prospective student-athlete took almost 18 core courses in 2000, there must be an effort to educate and advise prospective student-athletes, parents, coaches, teachers and institutions of this rule change.

Therefore, the proposal has a delayed effective date of August 1, 2013, for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2013.

As a point of reference, this proposal would impact those individuals who will enter the eighth grade in fall 2008.

The NCAA Eligibility Center and the membership services staff are committed to educating these different groups to minimize the impact of the increased criteria.

This proposal will align Division II rules with those required for high school graduation and Division II admissions, while better preparing our student-athletes for meeting the rigors of the academic world in the first year of collegiate enrollment.

For this reason and for the reasons previously stated, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

The Academic Requirements Committee is charged with reviewing the legislation in Bylaw 14 to determine whether the academic benchmarks for eligibility are appropriate.

In doing so, the committee uses research in making its decisions. The same information is then used by the Management Council and the Presidents Council to determine whether to proceed with the legislative recommendation.

Upon review of the research regarding core-course requirements for initial eligibility, the data revealed two key points.

Specifically, the data showed that although high school requirements vary from state to state, the current rule in Division II for athletics participation during the initial year of collegiate enrollment does not align with what most states require for high school graduation.

In addition, the data showed that the current core-course requirements for initial eligibility are not in alignment with the typical Division II admissions requirement.

This change is not being made because Division I increased its core courses for initial eligibility to 16. Rather, the change is a reflection of Division II-specific research that showed that the increase in core courses from 14 to 16 will better align the Division II requirements for athletics participation during the initial year of collegiate enrollment with the current requirements for high school graduation and the current Division II admissions standards.

However, the increase of core courses will better prepare prospective student-athletes for the rigors of academics during their first year of collegiate enrollment at a Division II institution.

This proposal makes good academic sense. For this reason, I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Derita Ratcliff (Kentucky State University): Although I support the legislation, I want to ask a question and point out some information that actually was in part addressed by speakers at both Microphones 7 and 6, regarding the research behind the proposal.

When a similar proposal was adopted in Division I, there was research that spoke to the average number of core courses for student-athletes in the division.

I didn't see that information put forth to consider the proposal. I did hear the gentleman at Microphone 7 make that indication.

But as a body, if we could hear a little more of what the research showed there because our rationale and background information for the proposal didn't state that information.

Eric Hartung (NCAA Staff): As liaison to the Academic Requirements Committee, my team supplied the data that supports this proposal.

The average number of core courses for Division II student-athletes that comes from our eligibility databases, indicates that the average is approximately 18 core courses for Division II student-athletes.

Mr. Ambrose: Does that answer your question?

The research staff will post that information on our Division II Web site.

Rocky Horn (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 7.

This legislation would better prepare prospective student-athletes interested in Division II athletics for the challenge of managing a collegiate academic workload while competing at a high level of athletics.

Further, the effective date of August 1, 2013, provides high schools ample time to accommodate the new core-course requirements and limit the future ineligibility of students who would not have met this standard.

Also, the proposed academic requirements align with the majority of Division II institutions' admissions criteria.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Tim Selgo (Grand Valley State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

Proposal No. 7 will require that student-athletes who want to participate in intercollegiate athletics during their first year of collegiate enrollment earn two additional core courses.

Specifically, student-athletes will be required to earn one additional course in English, math or natural or physical science, and one additional course in any core area.

The research used in determining the breakdown of core courses in Proposal No. 7 indicated that there are variances in the number of core courses offered at high schools throughout the country, depending on where the high school is located.

Although there are variances in the number of core courses offered at high schools, the data show that the median number of core courses offered within a high school is 61. Very few institutions offered fewer than 20 core courses. Proposal No. 7 will increase the core-course requirement for qualifier status for initial eligibility from 14 to 16.

Based on the data provided, student-athletes, regardless of where their high school is located, should have at least 16 core courses to select from to meet this new standard.

In addition, the breakdown of core courses, by requiring an additional unit in English, math or natural or physical science and one unit in any core area, provides flexibility to student-athletes in selecting core courses.

The additional core course in any core area may be in any of the following areas: English, math, natural or physical science, social science, foreign language, philosophy and nondoctrinal religion.

Breaking down the type of core courses available to meet this new requirement even further, the social sciences may include geography, history, economics, sociology and psychology.

As previously stated, student-athletes will have an opportunity to meet the increase in core courses because of the varied number and type of core courses provided at high schools throughout the country and the flexibility of core course selection that is built into the breakdown.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 7 was approved, 238-31.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — SKILL INSTRUCTION — SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL — VENUE SIZE OF GROUPS

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 8 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Please refer to your green procedural issues document, Page No. 4, for the three official interpretations approved by the Division II Management Council.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee and Management Council, I move Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 8 will permit more than one group of student-athletes from the same team to participate in skill instruction with a coach outside of the playing season at the same time, in the same or different facilities, provided there's no co-mingling between the groups.

The proposal further specifies the size of the groups based on whether skill instruction is occurring in individual or team sports.

For example, in individual sports and team sports with a starting squad size of six or fewer, a group shall consist of no more than four student-athletes from the same team working with the coach at one time.

Whereas, in team sports with a starting squad size of seven or more, a group shall consist of no more than six student-athletes from the same team working with the coach at one time.

This proposal has been through many versions. During the business session at the last three Conventions, the membership has been asked to vote on an amendment to the individual skill instruction legislation.

The student-athletes and institutional administrators have made it plain and clear that the current rule is not working.

Student-athletes have noted their angst in that they are required to participate in individual skill instruction at all hours of the day and night because the current rule limits the group to only four student-athletes from the same team to participate in this type of activity with a coach at one time.

As a result, teams with larger squad sizes may begin individual skill instruction with the first group of four student-athletes beginning at 5 a.m. and conclude with the last group of four student-athletes as late as 11 p.m.

The division recognizes the need to create a balance with academics and athletics.

Are we hoping to promote this balance when we schedule required individual skill instruction in this manner? I think not.

While student-athletes focus their concerns on their well-being, athletics administrators focus their concerns in the area of facilities. Many institutions must share their athletics facilities with other campus groups. Scheduling is rather difficult because many times individual skill instruction is being squeezed into a schedule between inter-collegiate practices and competitions, intramurals, club team contests and physical education course work.

The current rule has created problems because participation in individual skill instruction can occur only with a group of four student-athletes from the same team with their coaches at any one facility at any one time.

Does this proposal solve every problem? No.

But Proposal 8 does begin to address the concerns raised by student-athletes and administrators.

For this reason, I strongly urge you to support the proposal.

Venera Flores-Stafford (Midwestern State University): What is the rationale for not letting the coaches go back and forth?

I think it's a hindrance for teams that only have one head coach and no assistants.

Stephanie Quigg (NCAA Staff): The Legislation Committee did review and discuss that issue when looking at the legislation.

As you have seen in the question-and-answer document and the procedural issues document, they did issue the interpretation as such.

If there are any questions or concerns about that, that really speaks to the merits of the proposal, and we are unable to answer that question.

Olin Dunford (South Atlantic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 8.

This legislation would alleviate time demands on student-athletes who have skill instruction very early or late in the day due to facility limitations.

Further, this legislation would increase participation in skill instruction because multiple but separate groups could benefit from skill instruction, which encourages efficient use of facilities and time.

Finally, this legislation will preserve the integrity of skill instruction by limiting the student-athlete to coach ratio, which prevents full team-like practices.

This legislation truly embodies our resourcefulness as Division II student-athletes.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Karen Stromme (University of Minnesota, Duluth): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 8.

Proposal No. 8 would benefit student-athletes by easing the restrictions regarding the number of student-athletes participating in individual skill instruction outside the playing season at any one time.

The current legislation places a strain on our student-athletes because of the size restriction of the groups and the limitation on the number of student-athletes who are able to participate at any one time.

This proposal was developed to begin addressing these concerns and student-athlete well-being issues.

First, the proposal addresses the limitations associated with the current rule in situations where team sports have a larger starting squad size and larger rosters.

Per the current legislation, only four student-athletes from the same team may participate in a group with a coach in individual skill instruction.

Proposal No. 8 will increase the group size for those team sports that have a larger starting squad size.

Imagine how much more efficient this process will be if coaches do not have to limit the size of the group to a maximum of four student-athletes from the same team when a team has a larger number of student-athletes in the starting squad.

Second, Proposal No. 8 would permit more than one group of student-athletes from the same team to participate in skill instruction with a coach at the same time, in the same or different facility, provided no co-mingling occurs between the groups.

Since the proposed change would permit more than one group, the hope is that student-athletes will no longer be required to participate in individual skill instruction during all hours of the day and night.

This proposal begins to safeguard and protect our student-athletes' time.

Finally, we can all recognize that this legislation is sometimes very difficult to monitor for compliance purposes. This proposal will not increase the difficulty of monitoring the rule.

Rather, institutions will continue to monitor the rule in the same fashion as has been done in the past.

As a staunch supporter of student-athlete well-being and a former Division II coach, I strongly urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

Stephen Jordan (Metropolitan State College of Denver): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would also like to speak in support of Proposal No. 8.

Proposal No. 8 amends the current legislation regarding individual skill instruction outside the playing season by permitting more than one group of student-athletes to work on individual skill instruction at one time, while specifying the size of the groups of student-athletes from the same team.

Proposal No. 8 is an example of compromise between the many different constituencies involved in inter-collegiate athletics.

During the 2007 NCAA Convention, a membership proposal to amend individual skill instruction was withdrawn by the sponsors of the proposal with the understanding that the division's governance structure was addressing the issue and intended to sponsor legislation to amend the rule at the 2008 NCAA Convention.

The governance structure met with many different groups to discuss the challenges associated with the current rule. The governance structure received feedback from sports committees, coaches' associations, student-athletes, faculty, athletics directors and conference commissioners.

Thereafter, three possible proposals were developed, and once again feedback was sought from the different groups on the potential impact of the rule change.

After many proposals and conversations and numerous revisions, what we see as Proposal No. 8 is the best solution and compromise to solve our problems related to the challenges associated with the current rule concerning individual skill instruction outside the playing season, while maintaining the philosophical intent of individual skill instruction.

This proposal may not be what all of the groups had hoped for, but it is a good first step in addressing the time demands and well-being issues of our student-athletes.

Moreover, it begins to lessen the burdens on institutional facilities.

I urge your support of this proposal. Let's prove once again that the spirit of compromise is alive and well in our division.

Eugene Hermitte (John C. Smith University): Our institution and the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association have taken positions of opposition to this.

We have been concerned with the efficient use of such facilities. The revisions in the proposal have adequately addressed that.

The problem is with the number of student-athletes participating at one time.

At one time the proposal was for two, then four and this time it comes back with six individuals.

This is no longer individual skill instruction or even approaching that level of what was originally intended by the measure.

With this larger number — six participating at one time — you could have a full infield practice in baseball. Compromise is worthy.

But this particular proposal, increasing the upper limit to six, moves away from the original intent of individual skill instruction.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): For those institutions with limited indoor facilities, this legislation makes a great deal of sense.

It lightens burdens on student-athletes and coaches, especially when those coaches are also faculty members and have very limited time.

This has been debated at length and discussed in a great deal of detail, and I urge support for the concept.

This does leave open another question, and it's something that needs to be considered in the long run.

At what point do we begin shifting from nontraditional season or individual skill out-of-season practice and start crossing the line that it becomes year-round practice?

That may or may not be a long-range concern that folks need to keep in mind.

However, given the immediate issue, there is a desperate need for facility relief, for coach/faculty relief, and above all else, to stop student-athletes from having practices at 5 in the morning, then going to a full day of classes, and then expecting them to do a great deal of after-class homework, research or whatever it may be.

We need to think in terms of what's best for the student-athlete on the one hand and then look at the long-range issue at another time.

[Proposal No. 8 was approved, 237-29-1.]

MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT — STRATEGIC POSITIONING PLATFORM

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 9 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Eddie Moore (Virginia State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 9 will revise the division philosophy statement to align with the division's strategic positioning platform.

The philosophy statement defines us. It outlines the division's core responsibilities and beliefs as to how athletics fit into the educational mission of the institutions comprising Division II.

The strategic positioning platform is a similar document.

If you recall in 2005, the Presidents Council agreed to implement a comprehensive study related to defining the characteristics and key attributes of the division.

The ultimate objective of the study was to clarify the division's strategic positioning and to provide an institution with an opportunity to celebrate who we are, what we believe in and why we do things the way we do.

The development of the division's strategic positioning platform is the result of research-based initiatives.

Over the past year, we have quickly discovered that the positioning platform is the fabric of the division.

Since both the philosophy statement and the positioning platform are essential to the future direction of the division, it seems appropriate that they should be consistent in the message conveyed.

Therefore, the proposal will update the philosophy statement by incorporating various components, such as the six attributes of our strategic positioning platform.

Since last year's Convention, institutions across the country have been implementing the division's strategic positioning platform. By adopting this proposal, we have another way to implement the platform.

For this reason and the reasons previously stated, please join me in support of Proposal No. 9.

John Mansuy (Wheeling Jesuit University): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 9.

I'm proud that I chose to be a member of Division II.

Many people in the membership have stated that the division has faced challenges associated with the dreaded "middle-child syndrome."

We're not Division I. We're not Division III. But we have overcome these challenges.

For years we have struggled with our identity. That all changed after the presidents and chancellors summit in the summer of 2005.

With the leadership of the Presidents Council, the division now has a strategic positioning platform to guide our future.

The platform outlines the division's positioning statement, containing the six attributes of learning, service, passion, sportsmanship, resourcefulness and balance, while also outlining the reasons to believe in the division.

Proposal No. 9 will incorporate these items into the philosophy statement. It is critical that our philosophy statement and positioning platform be reflective of one another.

We need to make sure that it is clearly articulated why we chose to be a part of Division II.

I urge you to join me in supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 9 was approved, 263-0-1.]

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS — ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE — ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE CENSUS DISCLOSURE

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 10 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. Remember, however, that institutions will be required to submit data from the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years during the first year of disclosure.

Antoine Garibaldi (Gannon University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 10.
[The motion was seconded.]

A central tenet of the NCAA's strategic plan mandates informed decision-making based on quality research.

One area of significant interest is academic-eligibility criteria. Decisions concerning academic eligibility to compete in NCAA sports must be scientifically and legally defensible.

Proposal No. 10 will establish a formal policy requiring all Division II institutions to submit academic performance census data to the NCAA.

This annual data collection will provide vital information that will be used by the membership to better understand the academic trajectory of its student-athletes.

Based on this information, the membership will be able to make scientifically and legally defensible determinations on academic eligibility policies and rules considering the impact of those policies by gender, sport and ethnicity, among other variables.

Currently, the governance structure has relied on ad hoc research initiatives for academically related discussions.

Examples of this are the mid-year certification survey, the one-time transfer exception, final season of competition survey and the six-hour requirement tracking form.

The Division II academic performance census would render these initiatives obsolete, consolidating and minimizing the data collection burden on member institutions, while yielding adequate response rates and improving the overall integrity of the information.

Additionally, an annual data collection or census establishes a longitudinal component that is germane to understanding academic trajectories and the long-term consequences of active and proposed policies.

If we are committed to informed decision-making concerning the academic policies that our student-athletes are required to adhere to, I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Approval of this proposal will provide us with a valuable educational and policy-making tool.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 10.

Proposal No. 10 provides a highly valuable tool to the Division II membership at a minimal cost.

The value of this tool cannot be overstated. We are mandated by the NCAA strategic plan and our own conscious as educators to make informed decisions based on quality data.

We are hampering the work of the Academic Requirements Committee, Management Council, the Presidents

Council and our membership if this proposal is not approved.

The academic progress of our student-athletes is at the core of our division. Making sound policies to establish the environment to foster that progress is inherent in our mission.

The cost is minimal. The NCAA has already developed and implemented the management tools that would facilitate this program in its Web-based academic tracking system.

All Division II athletics programs employ some type of tool to manage compliance. The NCAA has enabled the academic tracking system with an importing feature to extract much of the required information from our existing compliance software.

Currently, institutions are required to submit numerous academic tracking forms to the NCAA.

The academic performance census will eliminate that need for these other tracking forms, minimizing the reporting burden annually.

The academic performance census will allow the Academic Requirements Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council to make data-supported, informed decisions.

I strongly urge your support of Proposal No. 10.

[Proposal No. 10 was approved, 249-16-3.]

RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND FINANCIAL AID — PERMISSION TO CONTACT, TRANSFER RELEASE AND FINANCIAL AID HEARING — NOTICE OF INSTITUTIONAL DENIAL OF STUDENT-ATHLETE REQUEST

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 11 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Diana Kling (Peach Belt Conference): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 11.
[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation does not specify the time period by which an institution must respond to a student-athlete's written request to contact another institution about transferring, respond to a student-athlete's written request for release as a condition of the one-time transfer exception or notify a student-athlete in regard to the opportunity for a hearing when his or her athletics aid is reduced or canceled during the period of the award or not renewed for the following academic year.

The absence of such a time period in the legislation leaves student-athletes questioning the timing within which the institution will respond to their written request or notify them regarding nonrenewal or cancellation of aid.

Proposal No. 11 furthers the student-athlete well-being philosophy by requiring institutions to notify student-athletes of their decisions regarding a denial of written permission to contact, use of the one-time transfer exception, or the nonrenewal or cancellation of aid within 14 consecutive calendar days from receipt of a student-athlete's written request or the institution's decision to reduce or cancel aid.

Because this proposal will reduce the uncertainty that student-athletes face during these critical times, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Ann Martin (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Legislation Committee and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 11.

As previously stated, this proposal provides student-athletes with a time frame for which an institution will be required to notify them of its decision regarding a denial of written permission to contact, denial of the use of the one-time transfer exception or nonrenewal or cancellation of aid.

Current legislation requires institutions to notify the student-athlete in writing of the right to a hearing to challenge the denial of written permission to contact, use of the one-time transfer exception and nonrenewal or cancellation of aid.

Once a student-athlete requests a hearing, the institution must conduct a hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving the student-athlete's request for the hearing.

The proposed change establishes a time period on the front end of this process whereby institutions will be required to notify the student-athlete of its decision to deny such a request within 14 consecutive calendar days from receipt of a student-athlete's request.

Potentially, the entire process could be completed in a maximum of 45 consecutive calendar days.

As we know, institutional delays in the notification to a student-athlete in any of these circumstances can cause negative consequences in a student-athlete's ability to seek other opportunities at other institutions.

Frequently, institutions know immediately whether the student-athlete's request for written permission to contact or a release per the one-time transfer exception will be approved or denied.

The proposal will specify that the institution must notify the student-athlete of its denial within 14 consecutive calendar days of the receipt of a student-athlete's request.

The proposal attempts to minimize the amount of time that the student-athlete must wait to hear about the institution's denial of such a request.

In addition, institutions will benefit by having an established time frame within which they are required to respond or to notify the student-athlete of their decision to deny the student-athlete's request and provide information about hearing opportunities.

[Proposal No. 11 was approved.]

ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA AND BANNED DRUG LIST — INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS — NOTIFICATION TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

Mark Linder (University of North Alabama): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proper advisement and accurate information are essential during the recruiting process.

Proposal 12 will help ensure that prospective student-athletes have accurate information needed to assist them in knowing the division's initial-eligibility requirements.

Upon initial full-time enrollment, all prospects want to be eligible for practice, competition and financial aid.

This proposal will assist prospective student-athletes in understanding the academic requirements that they must satisfy to achieve qualifier status.

This information should be introduced early in the recruiting process.

This proposal makes good academic sense. Institutions are already required to provide graduation rates and the banned drug list to all prospective student-athletes at the earliest opportunity in the recruiting process.

Notifying them of the initial-eligibility requirements at the same time is only logical.

The basis of this proposal was an increased number of waivers in which inadequate advisement and misinformation of eligibility requirements were cited.

Proposal 12 will ensure that prospective student-athletes have accurate information and proper advisement much earlier in the recruitment process.

In Division II, we believe in balancing academics and athletics. Notifying high school prospective student-athletes of the academic requirements early in the recruitment process will put them in a position to rectify any potential deficiencies before initial full-time enrollment.

Therefore, I urge your support of Proposal No. 12.

Karen Soto (University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus): On behalf of the Management Council, I stand to speak in support of Proposal No. 12.

As educators, it is our responsibility to provide accurate information and sound advisement to our students.

The adoption of Proposal No. 12 will require institutions to do just that. It will require notification of initial-eligibility standards to prospective student-athletes at the earliest possible opportunity, but no later than the date before the student-athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent.

For institutions that do not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent, an institution's written offer of admission or financial aid will be substituted for the National Letter of Intent.

This proposal will require institutions to be proactive by advising prospective student-athletes and their parents of the division's initial-eligibility standards during the recruitment process. The intent of the proposal is to encourage discussion between prospects and the institution on how to meet these requirements.

If there are any academic deficiencies, they can be addressed and possibly rectified before a final certification is performed by the NCAA Eligibility Center.

In addition, this proposal is in alignment with the standards we already adhere to regarding graduation rate disclosure and the notification of banned drugs for prospective student-athletes.

By also providing the initial-eligibility requirements to prospective student-athletes and their parents, we advise these prospects of the critical information that will potentially have the most impact on them the first year of full-time collegiate enrollment.

For these reasons, we support Proposal No. 12.

[Proposal No. 12 was approved.]

RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — VIDEO/AUDIO MATERIALS

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 13 is a paddle vote with an immediate effective date. Please refer to the green procedural issues document, Page No. 4, for a modification of wording in the proposal that the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council have adopted.

There will be two paddle votes on this proposal. The immediate effective date will be considered first by paddle vote, and it needs two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the proposal, followed by another paddle vote on the merits of Proposal No. 13.

Heather MacCulloch (Bloomfield College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The immediate effective date was approved.]

Proposal No. 13 has an immediate effective date to permit institutions to take advantage of this permissive legislation that will permit institutions to provide athletically related electronic media materials to prospective student-athletes in their junior and senior years of high school and the opportunity to use additional recruiting materials as quickly as possible.

Proposal No. 13 will permit institutions to provide electronic media recruiting materials to prospective student-athletes beginning September 1 of their junior year in high school.

Current legislation restricts the type of electronic media materials that may be shown or provided to prospects.

This proposal will remove the current restrictions and permit any highlight film, audiotape or videotape to be provided to prospective student-athletes.

In addition, institutions will be allowed to provide prospective student-athletes with electronic media materials that are nonathletically related or from a community engagement activity at any time.

Advances in technology have made the production of electronic media materials less costly and more accessible to all institutions. This proposal will give institutions the opportunity to decide whether to create electronic media materials as part of the recruitment of prospective student-athletes.

These materials will allow institutions to be more creative with their recruiting materials and to provide more and better information to prospective student-athletes.

Finally, this proposal is consistent with the deregulation of printed recruiting materials that was adopted at the 2000 NCAA Convention.

That proposal left it to institutional discretion to determine the type of recruiting materials an institution sent to prospective student-athletes.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Wendy Taylor May (University of California, San Diego): On behalf of the Management Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

This proposal will permit institutions to use technological advances to more effectively and efficiently disseminate recruiting information to prospective student-athletes.

In recent years, the technology to produce electronic media materials has become more accessible, and it is no longer prohibitive to produce such items for recruiting purposes.

This is permissive legislation and does not require additional spending by institutions.

Rather, each institution will be able to determine whether to use electronic media recruiting materials at its own discretion.

Further, this legislation is a step toward allowing our recruiting regulations to keep pace with the changing capabilities of technology and each institution's ability to access those technologies.

Finally, the proposal specifies that violations of this bylaw would continue to be institutional violations, but would not affect the eligibility of prospective student-athletes.

We strongly urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 13 was approved.]

RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — VIDEO/AUDIO MATERIALS — COMPUTER RECRUITING PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Ambrose: With the passage of Proposal No. 13, Proposal No. 14 is moot.

We will move forward to Proposal No. 15.

RECRUITING AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — MANDATORY MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS — TIMING OF MEDICAL EXAMINATION

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

A year ago this body adopted Proposal No. 23.

In our conference, we were more concerned about the possibility that prospective student-athletes would need to have two physical or medical examinations before they participate in a tryout on the campus.

Thus, we submitted this proposal and asked that it be considered as one year.

It should be noted that we had to submit this by July 15, and there were some interpretations that then were rendered on July 24.

But we are still in support of this proposal.

Larry Holstad (Winona State University): On behalf of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport and the Management Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 15.

Pursuant to current legislation, before participation in any practice, competition, individual skill instruction or out-of-season conditioning activities, student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility are required to obtain a medical examination within six months before participation in one of these activities.

The rule also extends to prospective student-athletes and student-athletes who participate in a tryout. This legislation was adopted at last year's Convention.

The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport recommended sponsorship of the proposal.

But instead of a six-month window, the committee recommended a six-week window in which student-athletes could obtain a medical examination.

There was a compromise to extend the time period to six months for a medical exam to account for the challenges that an institution faces when trying to accommodate a large number of student-athletes at one time.

However, it should be noted that the compromise from six weeks to six months does not compromise the health and safety of the student-athletes.

Proposal No. 15 is attempting to extend the window from six months to one year. Much can happen to a student-athlete in a year.

The intent of the shorter window of time was to obtain the most up-to-date medical information before the student-athlete's initial participation in physical activities.

There's a greater possibility of failing to discover a medical issue before such participation if the window of time in which to obtain a medical examination increases.

Finally, the governance structure has already addressed the timing of medical examinations for prospective student-athletes who participate in tryouts.

The interpretations defer to the timing in which prospective student-athletes obtain their medical examination before participation in physical activities at their high school, two-year college or four-year institution.

If the prospect obtains a medical examination within six months before participation in physical activities at his or her school, and the high school, two-year or four-year college accepts the exam for the academic year, that same medical exam may be used to satisfy the requirements for a tryout.

I believe that these two interpretations eliminate the need for this legislative change.

For all these reasons, I urge you to vote in opposition of this proposal.

Daniel Dickson (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II national SAAC opposes Proposal 15.

Student-athletes have expressed concern with the potential changes in health that can occur over the period of one year, greatly increasing the health risks associated with participating in athletics.

The Division II SAAC agrees with the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport recommendation to oppose this proposal as it threatens student-athletes' well-being.

The proposed additional six months would be trivial in the face of danger to the health and lives of student-athletes.

The Division II student-athletes encourage you to oppose this legislation.

Ann Jirkovsky (Bellarmine University): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in opposition of Proposal No. 15.

Proposal No. 15 will expand the window in which a student-athlete is required to obtain a medical examination before participation in any practice, competition, individual skill instruction or out-of-season conditioning activities, while also expanding the time period to obtain an updated medical history in subsequent years.

A complex procedural issue must be addressed with this proposal.

It is important for delegates to know that all three divisions have the same requirement in the playing and practice season legislation requiring mandatory medical examinations.

At the 2007 NCAA Convention, the membership adopted this legislation as a common provision. A common provision is a regulation that applies to more than one division, in this case all three divisions.

Moreover, to amend a common provision, all applicable divisions must adopt a proposal for it to be effective.

Therefore, even if Proposal No. 15 is adopted, the recommended change to the mandatory medical examination legislation in Bylaw 17.1.5 would not become effective until Divisions I and III adopt the same change.

Neither of those divisions is reviewing Proposal No. 15 at this year's Convention.

As a result, the rule requiring student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility to obtain a medical examination within six months before participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activity will remain in effect.

Finally, the application of the two interpretations issued in regard to mandatory medical examinations in tryouts of prospective student-athletes eliminates the need for this proposal.

Currently, institutions may defer to the timing of prospective student-athletes' medical examination for participation at their current high school or two-year or four-year institution.

Therefore, if a prospect received a medical examination within six months before his or her participation in practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities at the school, the Division II institution may use the same exam for the purposes of a tryout.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in opposition of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 15 was defeated, 61-204-4.]

ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM — 14-CONSECUTIVE DAY GRACE PERIOD

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 16 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Jim Johnson (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I move Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Wendy Taylor May (University of California, San Diego): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 16.

Current legislation requires that all student-athletes trying out for an institution's athletics team must complete the NCAA drug-testing consent form before practice and competition.

The current legislation does not recognize that many student-athletes who try out for the team do not go on to participate. The time and effort spent requiring student-athletes to complete the NCAA drug-testing consent form before a tryout creates additional paperwork and wasted time.

Student-athletes should complete an NCAA drug-testing consent form and be added to the squad list once it is determined they are a member of the team.

This proposal streamlines the tryout process and allows for additional opportunities for student-athletes. Institutions can provide tryout opportunities without the necessity of the NCAA drug-testing consent form paperwork.

Please join us in support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 16 was approved.]

ELIGIBILITY — SEASON-OF-COMPETITION WAIVER — COMPETITION WHILE ELIGIBLE — DOCUMENTED COACH'S MISUNDERSTANDING

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 17 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 17 broadens the scope of the season-of-competition waiver legislation for instances in which an eligible student-athlete competes in limited competition because of an extenuating circumstance.

Currently, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition if one of the following three extenuating circumstances results in a student-athlete's inability to compete for the majority of the season: 1) A life-threatening injury or illness was suffered by a member of the student-athlete's immediate family; 2) Extreme financial difficulties were suffered as a result of a specific event experienced by the student-athlete, or an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent; and 3) The institution dropped the sport in which the student-athlete had already competed.

The proposed change would add a fourth extenuating circumstance.

It specifies that a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition if the student-athlete's coach can verify that he or she did not understand that entering the student-athlete into limited nonregular- season competition would trigger the use of a season of competition.

Often, a student-athlete relies on good faith in the coaching staff to understand the legislation and trusts the coaches to recognize the ramifications of asking that student-athlete to represent the institution in competition.

Under this proposal, a student-athlete will not be penalized with the loss of a season when a coach mistakenly enters him or her into competition if the institution can objectively demonstrate the error was made because of a coach's misunderstanding of the legislation.

It is important to note that an institution would not be permitted to self-apply this legislation, but rather would be required to submit a waiver request to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.

This process will continue to ensure that the circumstances satisfy the intent and application of the legislation.

I strongly urge your support of this proposal.
[Proposal No. 17 was approved.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — LIMITS ON COUNTABLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO AND DURING THE FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 18 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008.

Diana Kling (Peach Belt Conference): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 18.
[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 18 will require that all countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week before the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of the institution's final examinations.

This proposal will ensure that outside of the playing season — when student-athletes should focus on academics — all student-athletes have the opportunity to concentrate on their academic endeavors without the distraction of required weight training, conditioning and skill instruction.

This proposal supports the division's attribute of balance and the acquisition of knowledge in concert with athletic skill.

In addition, Proposal No. 18 supports the division's philosophy of promoting academic success and graduation by student-athletes. The additional time devoted to studies is a direct benefit to student-athletes and their well-being.

Outside the playing season, student-athletes should be provided time to focus on their course work during the critical final examination period to ensure the successful completion and continued progress toward a degree.

Please join me in support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 18 was approved.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — PRESEASON PRACTICES — ON-COURT PRACTICE — START DATE

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 19 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. This is a membership-sponsored proposal sponsored by the Peach Belt Conference and the Northeast-10 Conference.

David Brunk (Peach Belt Conference): I move Proposal No. 19.
[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation specifies that on-court preseason basketball practice may not begin before October 15.

In years when October 15 does not fall on a weekend, institutions must conduct promotional and community outreach events during the week when attendance is generally lower than if such events occurred during a weekend.

By moving the first opportunity to practice to 7 p.m. on the Friday nearest October 15, student-athletes, coaches, training staff, prospective student-athletes and students in the general public could participate in practice in the evening and return home at a more reasonable hour.

Additionally, this change is consistent with the Division II strategic positioning platform regarding community engagement initiatives and opens the door for many opportunities.

Please remember that since legislation was adopted for the October 15 start of practice, a flood of institutional waiver requests are fielded each year by the membership services staff seeking relief to permit a Friday start.

The well has run dry, and relief is no longer being provided. We need to change the legislation to permanently fix the issue.

I encourage your support for this proposal.

Barbara Dixon (Truman State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal 19.

Current legislation regarding the first permissible on-court practice session in basketball specifies that such activities must not occur before October 15.

Proposal No. 19 will amend that first date to begin no earlier than 7 p.m. on the Friday nearest October 15.

This means that the date for on-court basketball practice will fluctuate depending upon the calendar year.

There will be some instances when the Friday nearest October 15 will be before October 15 or after October 15. When reviewing calendars through 2030, the earliest date on-court practices could begin would be October 12, while the latest date is October 18.

Over the past several years, the division has actively engaged in deregulating legislation where appropriate.

The membership wanted consistent start dates in playing and practice season legislation to avoid confusion as to when institutions and student-athletes could begin the championship segments for practice and competition.

If this proposal is adopted, the deregulation effort will be chipped away.

There's a simplicity involved when there is a consistent start date for practice in basketball.

This proposal will potentially cause confusion again. For this reason and the reasons previously stated, I ask you to join me in voting against this proposal.

Douglas Warrick (University of South Carolina Aiken): I speak in support of Proposal 19.

As mentioned in the earlier statement of rationale, this proposal, in keeping with the strategic positioning platform each of us has embraced, would open the door to a great opportunity for a member institution to implement a community engagement initiative in conjunction with the opening of practice.

The Division II Community Advisory Group worked hard to develop a means by which to assist willing institutions in their efforts to better connect and engage with the communities.

Through this effort, tools were developed to provide institutions a mechanism to heighten their level of involvement in the community or further accentuate programs currently engaged in their community.

This proposal would allow an institution the flexibility to strengthen its local identity and build a bridge between campus and community.

I strongly encourage your support of this proposal.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): For this august body I would like to run a little quiz for you.

December 25th; February 2nd, that's Ground Hog Day, that's a national holiday in Pennsylvania; July 4th ...

Now let me ask you this question. What is the first Sunday after the first full moon of the vernal equinox? March 23, that's Easter.

We set the date in Division II to deregulate several years ago — October 15. We know it's October 15. I think it's a great piece of legislation that we had to deregulate several years.

I also would question the idea behind community engagement because I know that I would question the sanity of any institution in Pennsylvania that would do a community engagement activity on a Friday night in a small town in Pennsylvania against high school football.

I think there is some logic to it, but I also think that it's not a consistent product.

I hope Division II will support what the Presidents Council's position has been and vote in opposition to Proposal 19.

[Proposal No. 19 was defeated.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 20 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. This is a membership-sponsored proposal sponsored by the Peach Belt Conference and the Northeast-10 Conference.

David Brunk (Peach Belt Conference): We'll try this again. I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, an institution shall not play its first contest against outside competition before November 15, aside from the exceptions outlined by Bylaw 17.5.3.1.

This proposal will establish a common start date for regular- season contests that will allow an institution to

play its first contest on a weekend.

Permitting the first contest to begin on a Friday will provide for new opportunities with inter-conference play such as conference challenge tournaments and other opportunities to enter into a community-engagement initiative in conjunction with the season-opening contest.

Additionally, we would be looking at reduced missed class time for student-athletes at a critical point in the semester.

I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Joseph Polak (Southern New Hampshire University): I support Proposal 20.

With the advent of our regionalization philosophy, a current cause of concern among the membership is scheduling.

In particular, institutions not willing to compete against another in their region, feeling that a better chance of at-large tournament selection would result if selective scheduling was used.

Allowing this to occur only creates frustration and animosity among regional advisory committee members, national committee members and our own institutions.

Regionalization aligns with the Division II positioning platform and is an important feature of the Division II championships access philosophy.

This proposal, by ensuring a consistent start date on Friday, allows institutions to think outside the box and schedule competition like inter-conference tournaments over a weekend and provides the ability to creatively promote high-level competition locally and regionally, while enhancing the student-athlete experience and alleviating the schedule problem many of us face.

I urge you to support this proposal.

Eddie Moore (Virginia State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 20.

Proposal No. 20 specifies that a member institution shall not play its first contest, game or scrimmage with outside competition in basketball before the second Friday of November.

The current rule specifies that the first contest may not be played or occur before November 15, which happens to be my birthday.

At the 2003 NCAA Convention, the membership approved a membership-sponsored proposal to establish a consistent start date for the first contest in basketball.

The intent of this proposal was to eliminate the requirement that institutions be responsible for calculating the first contest date for future years and continually update the division's manual.

Proposal No. 20 would derail the deregulation effort that has been so successful.

If the proposal is adopted, then the dates on which the first contest can be played in basketball would vary from year to year.

Depending on the calendar year, the first contest could be as early as November 8 or as late as November 14.

In addition, with all of the demands placed on compliance officers, it has been beneficial for them to point to one date, my birthday, on the calendar in which each institution may begin contests in basketball.

If you believe in supporting the continuation of the division's deregulation effort, I ask you to vote against this proposal.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I move that November 15 be named Eddie Griffin National Tip-Off Day in Division II.

While I agree with the Presidents Council, I think this is also a life balance issue.

By moving the winter season earlier, we'll have a weekend that will now conflict with conference volleyball tournaments and the end of football seasons.

I'm not very eager to tell my sports information directors, game event managers and athletic trainers that weekend could have a football game, a basketball game and a volleyball tournament all occurring at the same time.

That's not going to be a particularly fun thing for everybody and our facilities.

I'm a little concerned about the Disney Tip-Off Tournament that we started in Division II several years ago.

I believe a couple of these weekends will now conflict with that tournament, which has been set aside in the preseason as a tip-off tournament and the only one in Division II.

Now the regular season would conflict with those dates and possibly take away from those tip-off tournaments for us that we are trying to keynote in Division II as possible important dates for Division II and develop a little project around that.

Hopefully you will join with the Presidents Council in defeat of Proposal No. 20.

Teelah Grimes (East Coast Conference): I'm a basketball student-athlete from the East Coast Conference. I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 20.

Although the configuration of some calendar years will allow contests to begin significantly earlier than in years past, the maximum number of contests, which remains unchanged, will maintain the relative length of the season.

Also, permitting the first contest to occur on a Friday should attract larger numbers of community members to the event. This proposal will encourage community engagement, which has been shown to benefit the Division II membership.

Most importantly, this would allow unique travel and competition opportunities without jeopardizing the academics of student-athletes.

The student-athletes encourage you to support this legislation.

Mr. Ambrose: It is now time for our paddle vote on Proposal No. 20.

I'm going to exercise something for the first time this morning. Let's move this to a roll-call vote.

In the meantime, while they are setting this up for a roll call, Dr. Moore, I would be disappointed if you didn't receive 296 birthday cards, some with gift cards in them. (Laughter)

[Proposal No. 20 was defeated, 89-177-2.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST — EXCEPTIONS — PRESEASON EVENTS — TIP-OFF CLASSIC

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 21 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008. This is a membership-sponsored proposal, sponsored by the Sunshine State Conference, the California Collegiate Athletic Conference, the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Peach Belt Conference.

Michael Marcil (Sunshine State Conference): On behalf of the Sunshine State Conference, the host conference of Disney's Division II Tip-off Classic on the east coast, I move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, the Division II Tip-off Classic preseason games may not be played before November 1.

Proposal No. 21 would permit tip-off classic games to be played beginning on the Friday preceding November 1 only in calendar years when November 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

This will help to keep games played on the weekend dates and to minimize missed class time.

Darrell Axtell (St. Martin's College): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 21.

The intent of this proposal is to permit the division's Tip-Off Classic to occur on the Friday immediately preceding November 1 when November 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

The impact of this proposal is to maintain a weekend format for the Tip-Off Classic and to keep the event near the beginning of November.

By allowing the Tip-Off Classic to occur on a weekend, this proposal will support student-athletes in their academic pursuits by minimizing missed class time related to the event.

Further, the Tip-Off Classic is already an exception to the first permissible contest date. Allowing the event to occur before November 1 in certain years will enhance the quality of the event and the experience for participating athletes without creating another exemption to the existing legislation or providing a competitive advantage to participating teams.

I encourage you to support Proposal No. 21.

Bob Hiegert (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I represent the California Collegiate Athletic Association, sponsor of the West Coast Tip-Off Classic.

I've been urged by my 11 members to be very brief and very concise.

I support whatever Mike Marcil just said and Darrell Axtell. But I would like to add this, that the West Coast has an off-site facility that is used by the Disney properties and the earlier date in November or late October is more desirable on the west coast.

We urge your support of this proposal.

Patricia Hardin (Concord University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I also would also like to speak to Proposal 21.

First, maintaining the Tip-Off Classic as a weekend event will benefit student-athletes due to less lost class time versus through the week.

It is expected, also, that weekend contests would improve attendance for the Tip-Off Classic contest.

For these reasons, I encourage you to support Proposal 21.

[Proposal No. 21 was approved.]

Mr. Ambrose: Congratulations. We have completed our voting requirements with very few delays.

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

I would like to open the window of reconsideration for all the proposals we have just considered. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any proposal may move for reconsideration. We will pause for approximately five minutes and then I will re-open the floor for reconsiderations.

During this brief intermission, we are going to show one more Division II video that demonstrates our partnership with Habitat for Humanity, and then we will reconvene after that video presentation.

[Note: The delegates watched a Habitat for Humanity audiovisual.]

Mr. Ambrose: Let me ask you to reconvene for a moment.

Are there any motions for reconsideration? We'll take a moment to recognize any motions or speakers who may be at the microphone.

The window of reconsideration for 2008 proposals is now closed.

CLOSING REMARKS

As is our custom, we will now open the floor for any comments, thoughts, questions or reflections on where we're headed or what we're about.

This is our period for open forum. If you have a comment or statement, we would encourage you to make it at this time.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): We would like to take the opportunity from the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference to recognize the first leadership position from our conference on the Management Council or the Presidents Council, Dr. Roberta Page, who is concluding her term as the chair of the Management Council.

She filled a partial term, but we appreciate her time and efforts on behalf of Division II from the PSAC. We want to put that on the record for today.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): In listening today and also carefully reading the material in preparation, may I offer a friendly suggestion that more items might be placed in future consent packages.

As you noted today, there was very, very little debate on most of the legislative proposals. Items in the consent package can always be withdrawn at the request of the membership. I don't mean to criticize at all.

I'm suggesting that at future Conventions where we might have 40 legislative proposals, and 36 of them have virtually no debate whatsoever, we might save a lot of time. So just a friendly suggestion ...

Michael Marcil (Sunshine State Conference): We would like to recognize another individual who has con-

tributed so much to Division II over the last several years.

Mike Covone, our outgoing representative on the Division II Management Council, has helped us with so many of the tremendous initiatives that we've had the last few years and with a lot of the work on the Championships Committee.

We recognize and appreciate Mike Covone for all his contributions.

Carey Demos (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Division II SAAC, we appreciate the membership taking into consideration the student-athlete voice and for this experience that you've all given us. Thank you.

William Lide (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Based on our relationship with you over the years, it's been a wonderful experience working with you and getting to know you as both a colleague and friend.

Of course, I want to give homage to Mike Racy and all of his staff. They have been very good to not only the SIAC, but the membership at large.

Lastly, I'd like to thank Gwen Reeves, who chaired the Management Council. Gwen has been so actively involved from our conference level in keeping us abreast of the issues and getting us to the level as one of the model conferences in the country.

We feel very appreciative that she has been so good to us.

Also, Stephanie Harrison, who is now coming off.

So our voices have been heard and are continuing to be heard through people coming after them. I just want to give a special thanks to all of you in that capacity.

Jeffrey McLeod (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the CIAA, I would like to thank and appreciate the service of our former board chairman, Dr. Eddie Moore, who is leaving the Presidents Council, for his outstanding leadership as vice chair. We salute him today. Thank you.

Stephen Jordan (Metropolitan State College of Denver): I'd like to thank Dr. Ambrose for his consistent leadership and voice on behalf of our division.

There is no question in my mind that had we not had the vision of Chuck Ambrose for our platform, for what Division II could be, we would not be in the position we are today. We owe a big vote of thanks to Chuck Ambrose.

Chuck, thank you so much.

[Note: The delegates gave Mr. Ambrose a standing ovation.]

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you, Steve.

Roger Thomas (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): That's a tough one to follow, Chuck. I just want to say goodbye.

This will be the last Convention for the North Central. On behalf of the 80-plus years and thousands of athletes and coaches and administrators, it has been a wonderful run.

I want to acknowledge the North Central Conference and put it in the record that it's been a thrill. I think it's been one of the premier conferences for many, many years.

We all wish Division II the best.

We hope that our membership that's remaining in Division II has a long and illustrious future in Division II.

We wish those the best that have left us. That's their problem.

Division II is the greatest. Thank you.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): Our conference will suffer a loss in June when Doug Echols retires as our commissioner.

Doug has been the only commissioner to ever have held that post in the South Atlantic Conference, which is 18 years.

He has provided great leadership to the South Atlantic Conference. But as you all know, he's been a great friend of the NCAA and has been a great supporter of student-athletes, not only in our conference, but across the breadth of the NCAA.

So Doug, thank you so much for your service to the South Atlantic Conference and the NCAA.

Lloyd Raymond (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): Two thank yous.

First of all to Larry Holstad, the athletics director at Winona State University, for serving us on the Management Council so well and for what he's done and what we've accomplished. We're very appreciative of that.

Larry, thank you.

And secondly, Roger took the words out of my mouth. They really have been our mentors in the Northern Sun as we've started our league and competed against them for the last 15 years.

We're going to miss them. We want to thank them for everything that they have done, even some of the losses that they gave us. There were some wins we had. But we're very, very appreciative of the North Central Conference, and we wish everybody the best. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: Let me, on behalf of the Presidents Council, give special recognition.

We've had great leadership throughout the governance structure. You've seen it work here today. We want to give special appreciation to Roberta Page, David Riggins, Dave Brunk and Mike Covone.

But I want to go back just a little bit further to Management Council chairs like Jill Willson, Paul Engelmann and Sue Willey.

There's been a real shift. The Presidents Council said just a couple of years ago that there was a tremendous amount of confidence in the process. It's a lot of work to legislate student-athlete welfare and the other things that we have considered today.

But the Management Council took that charge and has effected a change that has allowed for this paradigm shift that we're in — from a legislative environment that we have to maintain to strategic best practices where we work very hard together to develop tools that we can take home and use to the best of our ability.

Nate, your comment was a very relevant one. This is a process. I would encourage us to sustain that process and as Dr. Brand has encouraged us to accelerate it.

I need to give a special word of appreciation to our national office staff. For those of us who work with them every day, they work on our behalf. They do it in some very dedicated and committed ways with quality and the heart for our institutions first. All of these pieces wouldn't come together if they didn't choose Division II.

You know who they are if I started calling out membership services and our News and our legislative staff and all the assets that Dr. Brand has given us — but especially Mike, Terri and Ruth. I appreciate their friendship and support.

We're at the close of our business session. We chose Division II. Now let's go out and let other people know why we did. Congratulations.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 11:19 a.m.]

DIVISION III FORUM

SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 2008

The Division III Forum was called to order at 9 a.m. by John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Fry: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to today's Division III Forum.

I am John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College, and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's session.

Joining me on the dais this morning are Paul Tribble, president of Christopher Newport University, who serves as vice chair of the Presidents Council; Val Cushman, executive assistant to the president of Washington and Lee University and chair of the Management Council; Dan Fulks, faculty athletics representative at Transylvania University, who serves on the Management Council and the Division III Working Group on Membership Issues; and Rudy Keeling, commissioner of the ECAC, who serves on the Management Council and chairs the Division III Working Group on Membership Issues.

Also joining me are Eric Hartung, associate director of research for Divisions II and III; Dan Dutcher, NCAA vice president for Division III; Leah Nilsson, NCAA director of Division III; Jay Jones, director of membership services and the Division III governance liaison at the national office; Jeff Myers, associate director of membership services, who also serves as Division III governance liaison; and Georgana Taggart, faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who serves as our parliamentarian.

Jay and Jeff will serve as our interpretive experts during our discussion of proposed legislation today and tomorrow.

Also joining us in the front of the room is a court reporter to help create an accurate record for this morning's meeting.

We will focus on two primary topics this morning.

First, we have reserved almost two hours to discuss in detail the findings and recommendations of the Division III Working Group on Membership Issues.

This will be a three-part presentation. Each part will include a PowerPoint presentation followed by a round-table discussion with questions moderated by a member of the governance structure or staff. There are approximately 90 tables here, and we hope to forward a written summary from each table to the governance structure.

Second, Jay and Jeff will lead a review of the legislative proposals we will consider during tomorrow's business session. We have reserved the last half hour for that presentation.

Again this year, all of the information covered in this session is available on the Division III Web site, so we have attempted to limit handouts. But I do want to be sure that you received the booklet that summarizes the working group's findings and its recommendations. That booklet was distributed at registration. We have additional copies available at the back reference table if you need one.

We are scheduled to adjourn at 11:30. Because we have a lot of ground to cover, we have not scheduled a formal break. I know you are very interested in our first topic — membership growth and membership structure.

This issue is very important, very complicated and at times can become emotional as well.

At last year's Convention, we noted the Executive Committee had charged two groups, an Association-wide working group and a Division III working group, with developing structural models to address the significant membership growth that has occurred and is projected to take place within Division III.

I will say more about Division III's growth in a few minutes.

However, one aspect I want to emphasize is that the Executive Committee's concern related to membership growth includes significant issues in the other two divisions.

Division I has experienced significant growth and recently established a moratorium on new members to further discuss membership criteria.

Remember also that despite this growth, less than 10 percent of Division I athletics programs operate in the black.

Division II has experienced significant membership migration to Division I, but an almost equal number of schools have integrated to Division II from the NAIA.

Division II is focused on becoming more of a membership destination, including a strategic positioning platform and a study on the enrollment and retention benefits of the small scholarship model.

There are approximately 4,000 post-secondary institutions of higher learning in the United States. Only 1,000 currently are members of the NCAA.

Intercollegiate athletics is a growth industry, and our Association is the market leader. We should acknowledge that fact and recognize that continued growth and related issues and pressures are inevitable.

In addition, the Executive Committee and national office leadership believe that membership moratoriums and caps are at best short-term measures to permit the establishment of more long-term comprehensive solutions to fundamental challenges.

As we all know, the Division III brand has proven very popular within the field of intercollegiate athletics.

In Division III, we have grown by 120 new members since 1990. About two-thirds of those schools have come from the NAIA.

Current active membership of 420 is projected to grow to 464 in the year 2016, with additional growth approaching 480 members by 2020.

The only reason that these numbers are not higher is because we are only accepting four members a year, a process we established last year by voting for Proposal No. 9.

What have these newer members looked like?

As you will hear and see in a minute, their average enrollment and sports sponsorship has been significantly different from existing members, and their athletics perspective, which I might add is entirely legitimate, seems to differ as well.

There is no reason to expect this trend will not continue. There are also practical ramifications associated with this growth, including reduced championships access and reduced access to national office programs, services and financial support.

In 1973, this Association created a new membership structure to accommodate the increasing growth and diversity of its membership. That model was the creation of a third membership division, and that structure has served us well for the last 35 years.

The central question today is this: Will that model continue to be the best structure to serve our needs during the next 35 years, or will another model better position us for anticipated growth?

Ultimately then, this entire discussion is largely, although not exclusively, about membership growth, how to understand the growth that has taken place, the growth that is underway now, and the growth that can certainly be expected in the future.

The NCAA Executive Committee questioned whether the current three-division framework is the best approach to manage this growth. It charged the two working groups with learning as much as possible about this growth and answering the related question: How should the NCAA as a membership association within a dynamic growing industry best accommodate that growth from a structural standpoint so it is positioned for the long term?

The Executive Committee also specifically charged the working group to consider a subdivision within Division III and the creation of a new division within the NCAA as possible structural solutions.

Please remember that in either model a Division III institution could remain in its current membership grouping.

Self-determination will continue to be the guiding principle, and members would not be assigned to a new grouping regardless of conference affiliation, enrollment, sports sponsorship or any other criteria.

Also note that any structural change, if adopted by the membership, would be delayed by at least two years to permit adequate time for member institutions and conferences to make an informed decision regarding their future identity and affiliation.

If a new grouping is established, the members of each grouping ultimately would define the principles and related legislative standards of the grouping. This could include a level of standards less demanding or more demanding than those currently in Division III.

But please note that when we use phrases like more restrictive and less restrictive, we really are referring to ways in which the new groupings will be distinguished from each other and not necessarily assume that each grouping will automatically adopt standards different from those that currently exist in Division III.

The timing of this discussion is critical. The Executive Committee and national office leadership believe that the time to address these issues is before the consideration of the Association's next broadcast agreement.

That agreement generates approximately 90 percent of the Association's revenue and all of Division III's revenue. That agreement is scheduled to expire in 2013, a mere five years from now.

While it is not an easy discussion, the Executive Committee believes that addressing this issue now is consistent with its fiduciary responsibility to the membership.

I believe it is accurate to say that hanging over this entire proceeding is the question why do we need to change?

"Division III isn't broken, so don't fix it."

Let me give you my response based on five years of service to the NCAA and its Division III Presidents Council.

First, Division III is not an exclusive club for members only. We have no right to exclude institutions that wish to join us.

I am against caps, moratoriums or any other mechanisms designed to exclude worthy institutions that seek membership in the NCAA. Like it or not, this is what we have been and are doing because of our collective refusal to face this issue of membership growth and diversity head on.

Second, Division III is part of an Association, not an island unto itself. We, therefore, must take a broad, integrated perspective relative to membership issues and understand that our actions will have an impact on Division I and on Division II.

Third, the Division III scale, complexity and diversity have outgrown our organization and governance structure.

After 35 years, a time when our membership has virtually doubled, it is now time to expand and modernize our structure. This will help position us for a successful future.

Fourth, whether we like it or not, there are clear differences in program philosophy and approach, some of them deep that have begun to separate us in Division III. These differences manifest themselves in two wholly legitimate successful ways of managing an intercollegiate sports program.

The first is institutions that tend to sponsor fewer sports and have low participation rates among students and that provide a more intensive focus on sports for those who participate.

The second is the institutions that sponsor a larger number of sports and have high participation rates among students ... these institutions are seeking broad-based participation in athletics and also want to provide students with the time and flexibility to participate in other campus activities.

Both approaches are legitimate and both often call for legislation that satisfies their needs. Hence, the differences in the opinion we have each and every year with regard to various legislative proposals and the splits we have seen among our membership that have been demonstrated in the research that we have done.

Fifth, as members of this Association, we have a fiduciary obligation to approach these membership issues, growth and philosophy from a long-term perspective. We must strive to leave this division better off than where we found it.

If we take a pass on this because it is too disruptive or it is too painful, then shame on us and woe to our successors who will have to clean up the mess that we have made by letting this great division drift because the status quo was comfortable and convenient, and the work too controversial.

And last, the circumstances we have today make it a propitious time to take on this challenge. Strong, supportive and enlightening leadership from the NCAA has allowed and encouraged DIII to drive this membership growth process fluidly and we have a concomitant for change with the renegotiation of the television contract

and an opportunity to put things in order before that process begins.

We have been given a rare opportunity to shape our own destiny. Let's seize the moment and take on this work.

In closing, I would like to say this: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" is not the way to build a progressive, successful organization. If we stay with the status quo, then the DIII that we enjoy and admire today will likely be the DIII we experience a decade from now.

Let me now turn back to the proceedings.

I understand that there have been some questions about the format of this morning's forum. I would like to share with you the plans of the Convention Planning Subcommittee, and work through the membership issues regarding the discussions taking place today and tomorrow.

One thing I know we can all agree on today is that this membership structure issue is very complex and the issues in front of us require attention on both a broad and detailed level. I know we engaged in some of the broad concepts in the Association-wide forum led by Dan Curran yesterday.

The working group spent nine months discussing data and engaging in significant debate before making its recommendations on membership structure. It is our hope today to share with you some of the details examined by the working group as it came to its initial recommendation on membership structure.

You will have the opportunity in round tables to discuss the research and findings of the working group.

Again, it is our hope this morning that the conversation informs you of the reasons behind and the rationale for the working group's recommendations.

This afternoon, conference meetings represent yet another opportunity for conferences to consider the details behind this debate before we come together at the business session to share our ideas and thoughts on this very important matter.

To briefly address the format for the Monday business session, the original format designed by the working group and Convention Planning Subcommittee was to break the membership into three break-out rooms to engage in open microphone discussions.

Room assignments were made alphabetically in order to create a variety of conferences and institutional types in each break-out session.

The thinking behind that decision was that more people would have the opportunity to share comments in what would be a less-intimidating environment.

However, we received feedback yesterday that members would like to engage in a full membership open dialogue on Monday, something that we welcome. We have also heard concerns about the 11 a.m. start for this conversation.

Based on this feedback from the membership, the Management Council and the Presidents Council leadership decided to put aside the break-out room format and keep all delegates in one room for the open microphone session.

Further, the drug education and testing presentation will be moved from the start to the end of the business session.

This is currently our plan, although I intend to consult with the presidents at the luncheon immediately after this session to walk them through this and to solicit their input.

It is now time to renew and discuss the working group's findings and recommendations in more detail.

I would like to ask Eric and Rudy to begin with an overview of the athletics perspectives that exist in Division III and the related working group recommendations.

Eric Hartung (NCAA Staff): Thank you, John.

I would like to thank you for this great opportunity to present this information to you.

Distinct perspectives regarding athletics have emerged in Division III over the last two decades.

This trend refers to the division as a whole, not to the individual schools that make up the division.

In other words, the schools that have joined the division over the past 20 years are markedly different than their predecessors.

The following slides will illustrate that shift.

Division III has grown by 28 percent since 1990, bringing our current membership to 440 total members. We have 420 active and 20 provisional schools. This growth will continue bringing us to more than 460 members by 2016-17, with a potential for over 480 by 2020.

What do these newer schools look like and what can we expect the schools over the next decade to look like?

The schools that have joined the division since 1990 enroll on the average 1,100 fewer students and sponsor on the average four fewer sports than their predecessors.

The average enrollment of all current members is 2,600, with an average sports sponsorship rate of 16.4.

Let's break this down by the year schools become active divisional members to better illustrate this difference.

Along the bottom of this chart you will see the decades of this last century, and within those decade markings are the number of schools that have become active members in those decades.

When we look at the enrollment of current Division III members and the year they became active, this picture appears. Clearly there has been fluctuation over the decades. But there are still two key take-aways here.

First, these last two decades represent the lowest levels of enrollment for new membership in the division's history.

Second, based on our study of potential new members in the next decade, we do not expect this profile to change.

Sports sponsorship levels on the other hand across the history of the Association do not fluctuate like enrollment did.

Since the 1940s, schools that have eventually become known as Division III have sponsored fewer and fewer sports.

The average sports sponsorship for schools that have become active members over the last two decades is well below the current Division III average of nearly 16.5.

Once again, based on our study of potential new members, we expect this trend line to begin to flatten as we reach our current membership sports sponsorship criteria, but it is not likely not to take an upturn.

Let me be clear. The purpose of this exercise is to demonstrate the shift in profile that the division has experienced through its growth.

This is not a finger-pointing exercise. The sports sponsorship trend alone begs an important question. What does this say about how our newer members differ from our older members?

Let us now turn to look at historical voting patterns to further illustrate the shift in athletics perspective the division has experienced.

A bit of background is in order here. The working group studied the voting records from 2004 to 2006, isolating the 18 proposals that represented a possible shift in athletics perspective.

Those 18 proposals are detailed in your session booklet.

The more restrictive position on each proposal was identified and each school received a point in the index if it voted for that more restrictive position. The higher the index, the more often the schools voted for that restrictive position; the lower the index, the less often the restrictive position was supported.

Let me pause here for a moment to make as clear as I can the intention of this particular exercise about using voting patterns.

As in the study of sports sponsorship, this analysis is intended to examine voting patterns and what those voting patterns may mean for the division.

Does this school's voting pattern indelibly mark you as holding a particular philosophy or a member of a particular platform?

The answer is "no."

Individual votes can be cast for a variety of reasons, but multiple votes and trends over time are significant. Historical voting records on key proposals allow us to answer the question about whether legislative distinctions exist and to what degree.

This chart represents the distribution of voting indexes on those 18 proposals. This distribution can best be described by a model with one peak at 6 and the other at 14.

We can divide the distribution into thirds, where an index of 1 to 6 represents schools that were not in favor of additional restrictions.

The index of 13 to 18 represents those that did desire additional restrictions. The group with an index of 7 to 12 is schools that did not consistently vote one way or the other across these 18 proposals.

The take-away here is that approximately one-third of the division appears to have desired additional legislative restrictions.

One quarter did not, and approximately 40 percent were split on these issues.

The conclusion is that there appears to be distinct legislative perspectives in Division III.

Here is another very significant working group finding. There is a statistically significant relationship between the number of sports sponsored and the school's voting pattern.

This chart presents the two metrics side by side. Let's take this a step farther.

This chart is probably much easier to read in the green booklet that you received, but it is here on the screen as well.

The top line of this chart is the sports sponsorship trend line you saw earlier, with the bottom line representing the average voting index by decade relating to the year each voting member became active.

The two trends are very similar. We have two key take-aways.

Number one, schools that have become active members over the past two decades record the lowest average voting index and sponsor the fewest sports on average.

Two, based on our study of potential new members, we expect this trend to continue. To put it another way, the schools that have become members since 1990 sponsor significantly fewer sports than their predecessors and based on their voting record are not as supportive of additional legislative restrictions.

I would like to turn to Rudy to explain the Division III membership working group's recommendations.

Rudy Keeling (Eastern College Athletic Conference): After studying the voting patterns, sports sponsorship profiles and trends just reviewed by Eric, the Division III working group determined that the first step in answering the charge of the Executive Committee was to address the different perspectives on athletics that exist in Division III through a new membership grouping.

As we just heard, voting patterns on several key proposals in recent NCAA Conventions identified distinct perspectives about the role and scope of the intercollegiate athletics program.

One of these perspectives seems to favor a broader-based athletics program with a more limited student-athlete experience.

Another favors a smaller sports sponsorship profile with fewer limits on student-athlete experience. That perspective is expected to increase with continued membership growth.

Based on these divergent perspectives, the working group identified the first of three concepts on which a new grouping could be philosophically distinct from the current Division III.

That concept is as follows: Student-athletes are encouraged to pursue a more broad-based educational experience and participate in a full range of available co-curricula and extracurricular activities.

As a result, the athletics experience in each sport should be more limited in scope and duration.

Division III currently values the broad-based student-athlete experience. The new grouping can take that perspective one step farther by maintaining and even increasing limitation on playing and practice seasons, thus, encouraging student-athletes to participate in activities beyond their athletics.

Second, the working group focused on the opportunity for the new grouping to hold itself more accountable to the standards and expectations established by the grouping.

This accountability is expressed as follows: Institutions shall be held more accountable to philosophical priorities through a series of reporting or review processes, including financial aid, academic performance, special admissions, diversity, gender equity and sports equity.

This increased accountability could occur through either campus-based assessments similar to our institutional self-study, conference-based standards, like the conference self-study, or through nationally run programs, such as the Division III financial aid reporting process.

Finally, in support of a more truly integrated model of intercollegiate athletics, the working group identified this increased expectation for residential leadership.

Presidents must exercise greater authority and support for athletics programs in consultation with the appropriate campus constituencies to ensure full integration of the athletics program with the institution's educational missions.

Interestingly, while the NCAA has had an expectation of significant presidential leadership since federating in 1997, the current Division III philosophy statement is silent on this issue.

With an emphasis on the integration of athletics into the campus culture and mission, presidents in a new grouping could be held more accountable for oversight of their athletics program and participate more actively in the new grouping.

With that background information, please use the next 20 minutes to discuss the questions on athletics perspective with your round table.

[Note: The delegates participated in round-table discussions.]

Mr. Keeling: Once the working group identified the philosophical focus of the new grouping, that of a broader-based, more comprehensive athletics and educational experience, it then focused on what potential legislative concepts logically might represent that perspective.

The working group quickly identified two legislative concepts about which there was little disagreement.

The first concept was that the new grouping would not permit the awarding of athletics aid. This is consistent with the fundamental principle of Division III from which most members of the new grouping could be expected to migrate.

It also is consistent with feedback received from the executive working group that the awarding of athletics aid is and should remain a defining feature of Divisions I and II.

The second legislative concept upon which there was a strong consensus was for increased sports sponsorship requirements.

This seemed like a very logical extension of the principles supporting a broader-based educational and athletics experience for the new grouping.

The working group reviewed current sports sponsorship figures in Division III, noting that although the average is approximately 16.5, a significant number of schools are grouped around 10 to 13, while another significant grouping occurs in the 18 to 21 range.

The working group concluded that a minimum standard of 16 would make sense for the new grouping, but agreed that schools with lower enrollment and a high percentage of athletics participation also could choose to meet the broader-based sponsorship standard.

Dan Fulks will now identify those legislative concepts that the working group identified for further discussion.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): Thanks, Rudy.

Eric, Rudy and I were just talking. We think that we are probably much better off to have this meeting after the reception tonight because what is clearly missing here is the alcohol, so we are negotiating with President Fry and Dutch. There will likely be an open bar in the morning. (Laughter)

We will keep you informed on that.

I am going to share something with you, we are running about 10 minutes behind and we still have some material to cover. So my approach here is going to be to share with you the speed-reading course I took during the December break.

It was half a day, it cost me only \$500 and it has literally doubled my speed. It has cut my reading time in half. I am willing to share it with you this morning at no cost. I simply now just turn two pages at a time. It has had no impact on my retention because I never retained anything anyway. (Laughter)

So if there are some gaps in the logic, you will know why.

It certainly has been a privilege and sometimes a pleasure to work with this working group for this past year. I want to say thanks to Dan and Leah, Rudy and President Fry, not only for this opportunity but for their excellent leadership through what has been interesting and not always easy discussions.

While the working group reached easy consensus on the prohibition of athletics aid and increased sports sponsorship, there was less agreement on several other potential legislative concepts that logically might flow from a philosophical focus in the new grouping.

So let me emphasize, and this is very important, the following legislative concepts remain under discussion.

We are only at the beginning stage here. We are not at the end. We are only beginning. Consequently, your feedback regarding these concepts in Nashville and especially in the February membership survey will be important in determining the extent to which they might be featured in a new grouping.

I might add that the membership survey that is coming out in February will have at least four signatures on it: the student-athletes from SAAC, the FAR, the AD and the CEO.

Everybody is going to have participation and input into the survey.

Earlier we mentioned that the concept of limiting the scope of student-athlete experience to emphasize academic success and participation in other extracurricular and co-curricular activities. Let's think how this might be accomplished legislatively.

Possibilities might be the reduction of contest maximums and further limits on the scope and length of the playing season.

The new grouping could also establish steps to regularly monitor the academic performance of the student-athletes.

This could include the regular review of their academic profiles and academic performance compared with students in general.

This review would not necessarily occur to the NCAA, rather it could occur at the local and conference levels as an alternative.

A commitment to some kind of formal review process could be a condition to membership in the new grouping.

While the working group felt the principle of greater presidential leadership in the new grouping made sense, it wrestled with how that might be accomplished legislatively.

One concept could be to establish greater authority for presidential groups, like the Presidents Council and the Chancellors/Presidents Advisory Group, to identify key proposals and forward them directly to the presidents in the new grouping for consideration.

The new grouping could adopt standards to further limit recruiting. These could include the creation of recruiting calendars with common dead periods and quiet periods. Further limits on electronic contacts could also be established.

There were additional legislative areas that the working group discussed at some length.

In each case, however, the conclusion was that they would best be left for resolution later rather than sooner by the schools that ultimately joined the new grouping.

I want to emphasize again that the new grouping will define itself. We have no intent or desire to define the new grouping.

The first area relates to championships. To what extent would the championships program and the new grouping be similar or distinct from that which currently exists in Division III?

Certainly, the number and location of schools that join the new grouping would be an important consideration, but beyond that how would issues like access, ratios, selection criteria and budget priorities be developed?

Given the historical attention and importance that the membership has placed on our championships program, it seems prudent to approach this issue cautiously.

Similarly, to what extent might the members of the new grouping emphasize sports and program equity across the entire athletics program?

In certain sports, would membership in a different grouping be possible?

What about multi-group conferences?

This seems to be an issue best left to the members of the new grouping to determine in a deliberate manner later.

By the way, as we are discussing these issues, your feeling about these concepts may reflect your level of satisfaction with the current legislative standards that exist in our current Division III.

While some delegates would like to see the establishment of more restrictive legislative standards in these areas, others are reasonably happy with the legislative status quo, and still others may wish to see some standards liberalized.

The establishment of two distinct groupings could help significant segments of the membership achieve their respective goals.

Please remember two things in this regard that we discussed during the last segment.

One is the historical relationship between sports sponsorship and voting patterns. That relationship is there and it is clear.

The working group found a strong relationship between the number of sports that institution's sponsor and their willingness to vote in favor of further restrictions.

The converse would also bear consideration. Over time, the legislative status quo inevitably will be affected by the immigration of new members, most of whom on the average are expected to sponsor fewer sports and be less supportive in legislative restrictions than the division as a whole.

Indeed, the current Division III, with its anticipated growth, might choose to adopt legislation less restrictive than what is currently in place.

Each grouping will have its opportunity to find itself.

It is time for further discussion, and the questions are on your table and on the monitors. Beyond sports sponsorship, which legislative area should receive the greatest initial emphasis if a new grouping is created?

What topical area do you expect to provide the greatest opportunity for legislative change? And how important is continued championships access in the current division or in the new proposed grouping?

We will take 20 minutes for this and we will warn you when it is half time.

[Note: The delegates participated in round-table discussions.]

Mr. Keeling: We are going to move on to the final phase.

The final part of the presentation will focus on the structural options and the working group's related recommendations. I am going to turn it over to Eric to give you that overview.

Mr. Hartung: Thanks, Rudy, and thanks for your attention. I appreciate it very much.

We have a significant amount of information on hand about the schools that make up Division III. It is probably an understatement considering the green booklet that you received when you registered.

Beyond sports sponsorship and voting records, which we spoke about earlier, we have a wealth of information on institution finance, student financial aid, profiles of enrolling classes and athletics success.

This information will allow the working group to model various grouping concepts in order to project which schools were (a) qualified for a new grouping based on certain criteria; and (b) may be interested in a new grouping based on a school's voting patterns.

These are just projections. As previously discussed, this whole exercise is rooted in institutional self-determination. A school or group of schools may be "eligible" to join a new grouping, but they still remain autonomous in their decision to do so. Let's take a look at some grouping concepts.

Here are four concepts that the working group has focused on. You have all this information in your session booklet. You can take a look at slides 57 through 99. But I will not be going through Slides 57 to 99, I promise you that.

I am going to pull one concept out and walk through it for you as an example of the work that the working group undertook.

Let's take a look at a concept based on sports sponsorship enrollment, voting patterns and conference affiliation.

To assess interest or likelihood to move to a new membership grouping, we began with the criterion based on sports sponsorship and enrollment, very similar to the concept used in our current sponsorship requirements.

If the enrollment is greater than 1,000, then the school must sponsor 16. That is eight men's and eight women's sports.

If the enrollment is less than 1,000, the requirement is 14, and single-gender schools simply cut these requirements in half.

We then explore apparent willingness of an institution to adopt the new philosophy and related legislative standards using prior voting records as a predictor, in this case, a voting index greater than 10.

In regard to conferences, the intention here is not to induce the break-up of conferences. We realize that may be the reality for some conferences. We introduce a possible cushion where not more than two conference members can initially miss the criteria for the conference to move to the new grouping as a whole.

The expectation is that those one or two members will meet the criteria within a short period of time after realignment.

So how does this concept work? You will see we start with 440 members. That does obviously include provisional members.

This analysis predicts that about one-quarter of the current division would be both eligible and possibly interested in joining the new grouping.

It ends up to be about one-third of the conferences. Independents are considered a conference in this exercise.

Here are the conferences that we project would not move to a new grouping based on the criteria that we have set.

Remember, there are schools within these conferences that may be eligible and interested in the new grouping, but overall the conference would not.

Individual schools would be free to move if they qualify, but that would mean conference realignment. I am also aware there has been some shifting of conference affiliation since this information was compiled, and that obviously has an effect here as well.

Here is a list of schools that meet the criteria we have detailed in terms of sports sponsorship and voting patterns.

The asterisks denote the number of schools that missed the criteria, thus kicking in that cushion that we had just spoken about briefly.

Let's look at the profile of these two new groupings.

Let's start with sports sponsorship. On the sponsorship of men's sports, there are some interesting shifts when you break it up using these specific criteria.

For example, I highlight football, where 39 percent of the schools in what would be Division III would sponsor the sport and 96 schools in the new grouping would sponsor football.

There are some interesting shifts on the women's side as well.

In terms of athletics success, there is a significant contrast. Schools that would populate the new grouping historically have earned more director's cup points.

On average, at least 25 percent of the schools that we project would populate Division III did not earn any points in 2006-2007.

This clearly shows the effect of the competitive landscape of these two new groupings based on the criteria that we have laid out.

This slide shows the average number of director's cup points earnings during 2006-07 by each conference projected to remain in Division III and not join the new grouping.

This slide shows the average number of points earned by conferences projected to have interest in the new grouping.

To a large extent, these are many of the same conferences that have historically voted to support legislation to establish greater legislative restrictions in Division III.

The final slide is a summary of four key grouping concepts the working group examined.

You can see that as we rely on criteria, the number of schools projected to be eligible for and interested in the new grouping decreases.

The objective here was to project which schools would be eligible and willing to join a new grouping based on various criteria.

Clearly, the projection for each concept does not represent the exact number of schools that would join that new grouping should it be established.

Simply, this exercise allows us to create a baseline. Considering that the working group has discussed the figure of 150 as a minimum number of schools needed to make a new grouping viable, these projections show that each of the four concepts is viable.

Before I turn it back over to Rudy, I do want to thank you for your patience as we go through this information, and I do want to say that the compilation of this information would be impossible without the help of the working group and other members of the Division III research staff, especially Mike Miranda, the faculty rep from Plattsburgh State.

I will now turn it over to Rudy for some additional remarks.

Mr. Keeling: After looking at the potential ways that the division might divide, the working group began to consider the question of which type of structure best served the NCAA — subdivision or the creation of a new division.

In its discussion of the best structural model, the working group identified several concerns.

Because of natural resistance to change, segments of the membership may be reluctant to fully consider the creation of a new membership grouping requiring more communication and more education about the opportunities and benefits related to a new division and about the drawbacks or other alternatives, including inaction.

Also, legislative process issues are significant.

The subdivision could be accomplished by a majority vote of the Division III members. A new division would require approval of all NCAA findings by a two-thirds majority vote of all Convention delegates present and voting.

Ultimately, the working group recommended the creation of a new division and noted the following: Creation of a new division further underscores that a change to the membership structure is an appropriate Association-wide solution to the Association-wide issue of membership growth.

Subdividing Division III focuses more on a division-specific definition of an end solution to the problem.

Creation of a new division allows for a clearer distinction from other divisions, most notably, division philosophy and governance structure, but also including budget priorities and championships opportunities.

Creation of a new division recognizes that over time each new grouping is likely to adopt legislative standards either more restrictive or less restrictive that will further distinguish the groupings from each other.

Again, based on this background information, please discuss at your tables the questions associated with membership structure.

[Note: The delegates participated in round-table discussions.]

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS REVIEW

Mr. Fry: We will call the meeting back into session. It is now time to review our 15 legislative proposals. We want to be sure that you have a good understanding of these proposals going into your conference meeting this afternoon and before tomorrow's voting.

I will ask Jay and Jeff if they would present this information to you.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): Thank you, President Fry, and good morning everyone. I am with the membership services staff at the NCAA national office. I am joined this morning by my colleague, Jeff Myers, and we are going to change gears on you and talk about this year's legislative package that will be voted upon at tomorrow's business session.

We want to walk through the proposals. Before we walk through the proposals, we will talk about our game plan and what you have, and what resources you have in preparation for the business session.

The good news is you should have all the tools that you need to understand the legislative package.

You have the Official Notice, which is the small green and white book. You have the question-and-answer document, which is a rather lengthy green document. You also have the parliamentary procedures document.

In addition, an interpretation that was issued after the publication of those other documents was distributed as we had the round-table discussions, so you should have the things that you need in order to be prepared for the legislative discussion tomorrow.

I would like to thank the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee and Jeff Myers, for the hard work on the question-and-answer documents. Hopefully, that document answers many of the questions that you may have.

When looking at the proposals for those who have not been through a business session before or simply need a primer on how to read the legislative proposals, within the bylaw section, where it details the amendment to the legislation, the language that appears in italics is current Division III language that appears in the Manual that would be deleted if the proposal was adopted.

The language in bold face would be added to the Division III Manual if that proposal were adopted. That language, which is in normal text, is language that is already a Division III rule. It appears in the Division III Manual and would remain unchanged if the proposal were to be adopted.

We might have a few less minutes than we had planned, so our plan of attack is to go through a couple of different proposals in which we either had issues arise or questions that we feel we want to address, and then we will circle back and start trying to go through the full slate of proposals.

Jeff and I had a chance to meet with the commissioners at their meeting yesterday, so hopefully they are well-versed on the proposals.

We have met with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and their representative will be at your conference meetings this afternoon. In addition, we have met with the FAR group at their annual symposium this year in Baltimore.

So hopefully, there will be people in your conference meetings who can assist with some of the legislative questions that you may have.

Let's first look at Proposal No. 4.

This proposal would eliminate the use of electronic transmissions in athletics recruiting and limit that use to e-mail and to facsimile.

You would still be able to use the telephone. You would still be able to send hard copy, letters and other mail materials.

We wanted to point out that the effective date is August 1, 2008. There is an error in the question-and-answer document that lists the effective date as immediate. It is an August 1, 2008, effective date.

The other thing we wanted to point out about this proposal is that we have been asked about the Division I override vote.

Many of you may be aware that Division I has very similar legislation that it adopted last year. They went forward with an override vote to possibly change that at this year's Convention. That was not successful, so Division I has current legislation that is very similar to what you see before you.

In addition, Division II is voting on a very similar piece of legislation as well. They will be voting in tomorrow's business session on that piece.

We will not know the results of that at the time that our vote is taken.

The one piece that I would add to this particular proposal that is unique to Division III with respect to the ban on text messaging and other electronic transmissions, is that this proposal is not meant to restrict the admissions office or other offices on campus that are acting independently of athletics, and so the language of the proposal was purposely drafted to say the transmissions cannot be sent by or on behalf of the athletics department.

Another proposal that we have received some very legitimate application questions about is Proposal No. 9. This deals with the certification for CPR, first aid and AED use.

It was sponsored by the Presidents Council, came up through the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and it is going to specify that at least one individual employed by the institution who is certified in CPR, AED use and first aid, and familiar with the institution's emergency activation plan be present at each athletically related activity involving student-athletes.

I bring this to your attention because there are two things that you received this morning.

After the Presidents Council met, there were some application questions that dealt with this proposal.

An example was if the certified individual attending the activity needed to step to the restroom. It may sound comical, but it was a real example and one that needed to be addressed.

The Presidents Council took two steps. One is the interpretation that was delivered to you during this session. It attempts to answer two things.

First, it attempts to answer what it means to be present. Ultimately, the individual needs to be on site of the activity and responsible for ensuring the safety of the student-athletes. "On site" is interpreted as anything NCAA-related, I suppose.

So by on site, that individual needs to be available to carry out the emergency activation plan in the case of an emergency and focused on the activity that is occurring.

The other thing that you have is in your parliamentary procedures document and under the additional notes for No. 9 you will notice that the Presidents Council moved in their meeting to recommend and endorse that if this proposal were adopted there would be a modification of the wording based on the original intent of the proposal.

A number of questions that we received dealt with the situations in which an activity was required and the student was being told to go on their own and do that activity. An example would be students who would be told to run 10 miles between now and Thursday on their own during the season.

While permissible to do so, the way the legislation was written would have required someone who was certified to be with that individual at all times.

The Presidents Council would recommend a modification of wording that would indicate that the certified individual would need to be present at each athletically related activity that is the required physical activity scheduled for the team.

So if it is a required activity in which there is institutional involvement in the activity and the team is expected to be there, the expectation is that this certified individual would be there to oversee and provide the safety off site.

Those are the notes I wanted to make on that proposal.

I am going to click forward and let Jeff give you some information on Proposal No. 14.

Before I do that, I served as a scribe this morning at one of the tables. I was asked to recognize my new friends at Table 36. Evidently, I was a really good scribe.

Jeff Myers (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Jay. Good morning.

Proposal No. 14 addresses an issue when a strength and conditioning coach is also a team coach, which is a pretty common situation. This proposal still permits a strength and conditioning coach who is a team coach to monitor voluntary individual workouts.

However, when doing so, this proposal requires that the strength and conditioning coach monitor all student-athletes using the facility at that time. He or she cannot just be focused on his or her particular student-athletes.

This situation is not new. It has been the staff's opinion for some time. It appears in an education column. However, it has never been codified into the Manual.

That is the intent of this proposal.

Thank you, and with that I will turn it back to Jay.

Mr. Jones: That leaves us with about 10 minutes, so we are going on the fly. Forgive me for clicking around here, but I will simply start back now at Proposal No. 2.

You voted on Proposal No. 1 in yesterday's Association-wide session. Proposal No. 1 was adopted.

I will start with Proposal No. 2. We will work through these for our last 10 minutes. When we reach 11:30, we will hand it over to President Fry for some closing comments and you will be free to go.

Proposal No. 2 deals with the employment of prospective student-athletes at sports camps and clinics. It would have an immediate effective date. You may recall for those who were at last year's business session that this was a point of discussion on the floor.

This proposal attempts to address what was discussed and what was later determined through some survey results.

This proposal would permit prospects to be employed at institutional camps and clinics. It would also change the legislation that currently would not allow a coach to work at a privately owned camp or clinic that employs a prospect.

The coach would be able to work at a privately owned camp or clinic that was not an institutional camp, but employed a prospect.

Currently, you cannot do that. There would still be conditions on which private camps that the coach could work. There were stipulations within the legislation to address the elite-level camps with selected invitations and those sorts of issues.

Those limitations would remain in the legislation, and you can see those within the proposal.

The primary sponsor of Proposal No. 3 is the Midwest Conference along with several co-sponsors.

The effective date would be immediate. This deals with publicity of a prospective student-athlete's visits. This would permit the admissions office to publicize the visit of a prospective student-athlete in the same manner that those visits are publicized for students generally. The current legislation, as you look in your Official Notice, does not allow for the publicity of a prospective student-athlete's visit to campus.

There are a couple of notes on this one. The admissions office can do the publicity. It would have to be done by or through the admissions office, and the publicity must be done in the same manner as it would for all visiting students to the institution generally.

We have talked about Proposal No. 4 already.

For Proposal No. 5, I will turn it back over to Jeff.

Mr. Myers: Proposal No. 5 is a membership-sponsored proposal that addresses permissible academic and support services you may provide to your student-athletes. It is important to note that this proposal does have an immediate effective date.

The proposal only changes one word in the current legislation. This one word would allow greater flexibility to how the institutions provide services and programming to your student-athletes. It is best to look at that in comparison to the current rule.

The current rule requires that any services or programming you provide your student-athletes must be open and available to your students generally. This proposal would say that services can be exclusive to student-athletes so long as similar services are provided to the students generally.

That takes us to Proposal No. 6, which is also a membership-sponsored proposal. It addresses regulations regarding making up a game that extended outside the playing season. You will note this also has an immediate effective date.

The legislation permits institutions to reschedule either a conference championship game or contest that determines your automatic qualifier to outside the playing season if it is canceled for unforeseen circumstances.

Currently, if the playing season ends on the date of the scheduled contest, you may not extend it past that time. This proposal would allow greater flexibility to extend it if it is canceled for unforeseen circumstances.

There are two caveats. One, it must be limited in time and it has to be completed before the championships selection time period. And, two, it must be a contest that either determines your conference champion or an automatic qualifier.

Proposal No. 9 is another membership-sponsored proposal. It addresses the first permissible contest date in the sport of basketball.

This proposal would standardize that first contest date. Currently, the first contest date is the Friday preceding Thanksgiving. This proposal would set November 14 as a fixed date.

With that, I will turn it back to Jay.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Jeff.

The next proposal is Proposal No. 8. This is the proposal dealing with male practice player eligibility. It would be effective August 1, 2008, if adopted.

This proposal was originally presented by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and sponsored through the Presidents Council.

This proposal specifies that the limitations on the use of male practice players would be threefold.

One, they would be limited to use during the traditional segment within that sport. Two, male practice players would be limited to one practice per week. Finally, the use of male practice players would be limited to a number that is not exceeding half of a typical starting unit.

To demonstrate how this works, I will use basketball as an example. In basketball, there are typically five individuals who start the game, meaning you could use 2.5 male practice players. So looking up here, I think you could use Dan Dutcher, Jeff Myers and I would be a half because I don't play very well.

But the legislation doesn't require you to do that. Instead it lets you round up so that you can use three male practice players if that were the case. That demonstrates how the rounding up works and the infraction works.

Under the current Division III legislation, I want to remind you of what the restrictions on male practice players are. You can use an unlimited number of male practice players. There are no limits on how often you do so or what period of the year.

They are required based on changes in last year's session to be certified and eligible for participation before they participate with your team under the current rule.

I just talked about the limits that the proposal would put into place.

We spoke about Proposal No. 9.

Proposal No. 10 deals with the use of provisional members to meet the conference requirements for automatic qualifications. It has an immediate effective date. It is a membership-sponsored proposal.

Proposal 10 permits a provisional member to be used to count toward the seven members needed to earn an automatic-qualification bid for the conference.

You will notice in your parliamentary procedures document and Notice, that there is an amendment-to-amendment for Proposal No. 10.

It is put forth by the same sponsors. So 10-1 is the amendment-to-amendment. It would be effective immediately. It amends Proposal 10 to say two things. One, the conference that is using the provisional members must be a conference that has already earned an AQ, and that is trying to retain that AQ; or, they have earned the AQ and they are in the grace period. They are using the provisional members to satisfy the requirements on the back end of the grace period.

In addition, 10-1 only allows the conference to count years three and four provisional members toward the minimum of seven. Your three- and four-year provisional members are required to meet the Division III legislative requirements, so this change would only allow those provisional members to count toward AQ eligibility.

Those are the distinctions in the two. It is in your parliamentary procedures document.

Let's talk very quickly about how the voting happens for an amendment-to-amendment. Those who enjoy Robert's Rules of Order love this, so it is exciting stuff. The sponsor will stand up and move Proposal 10 and receive a second.

Before any discussion or debate takes place on the proposal, Proposal 10-1 will be moved and seconded. Depending on how the vote goes for the 10-1 amendment, the group will then discuss and vote upon Proposal 10, either as amended by 10-1 or if 10-1 is defeated as it was originally posed. That is how the voting will go. That is detailed in your parliamentary procedures document. The sponsors were certainly well-versed in how that is going to go. Hopefully that goes well during the session.

We were informed that Proposal No. 11 will be withdrawn.

That takes us through all of our roll-call votes.

Because of time, we are going to stop right there. I would encourage you to do two things this afternoon. Read your question-and-answer document if you have questions related to the proposals. My guess is that it answers the majority of those. I hope it does.

The other is to ask questions at your conference meeting of your commissioners and your SAAC representatives. They should be well-versed in this.

I am going to turn it over to John Fry for some closing comments.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Fry: Thank you, Jay, for that good summary.

I want to thank the delegates for your thoughts and comments on these issues. A special thanks to the panelists and the table facilitators for your fine work.

Can I ask the table facilitators to drop off the summary of their discussions at the front table? We would appreciate that.

Your input in the coming year, and especially in the membership survey to be conducted in February, will be crucial to the construction of whatever legislation package the Executive Committee and the rest of the governance structure forward for consideration at next year's Convention.

Finally, I remind the presidents that the luncheon and issues forum have been moved from the Jackson E-F Room to next door in Presidential Ballroom B. Thanks again for your attendance and participation.

We are adjourned.

[The Division III Forum was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.]

DIVISION III BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Fry: Good morning. Welcome to this morning's Division III business session. I am John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College, and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's Division III business session.

Joining me on the dais are Val Cushman, executive assistant to the president at Washington and Lee University and chair of the Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart, director of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph who again will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, vice president for Division III; Leah Nilsson, director of Division III; Jay Jones, director of membership services and the Division III governance liaison; and Jeff Myers, associate director of membership services and Division III governance liaison.

Finally, our court reporter again is joining us to help create an accurate record of our meeting. Please give your name and school or conference affiliation if you speak at a microphone.

Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any votes during this business session. Our procedures dictate that all voting is conducted by paddle or electronically rather than by voice or hand.

In addition, the Presidents and Management Councils have adopted a policy that we will use the electronic voting unit to vote on all legislative proposals. We'll now conduct a test vote to give us time to address any technical issues before we vote on proposals.

[Note: The delegates conducted an electronic test vote.]

CONSIDERATION OF CONVENTION NOTICE AND PROGRAM

Our first order of business is to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program.

When we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications unless they are re-ordered or have been withdrawn. If you intend to move to re-order a proposal, it will be time to do so in a few minutes. Please note that any re-ordering of proposals designated for roll-call vote also must occur via roll call.

Also please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you are adopting all of the appendixes found in the blue pages in the Convention Notice. This includes three legislative appendixes of note.

First are the interpretations in Appendix B starting on Page 29 that are to be incorporated into the Division III Manual.

Second is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C that starts on Page 31.

The third is Appendix D, which includes the modifications based on intent. They start on Page 53.

The amendments in these appendixes all have been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council and published in the legislative services database.

We will not discuss any of them unless you ask to do so. If there is such a request, we will then vote to accept the rest of the package, first by majority vote and then by going back and discussing the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration.

Incorporation is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Any proposals removed from the package for separate discussion and not subsequently approved are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration.

I will now ask for a series of motions from the floor to begin this process.

First, I will ask for a motion to adopt the printed Notice and Program so that we may proceed with our work. Second, I will ask for any motions to re-order. Third, I will call for motions to remove items from the appendixes.

After we deal with those motions, we will then vote to accept the Notice and Program as amended.

Is there a motion to adopt the Convention Notice and Program?

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): I so move.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Mr. Fry: Are there any motions regarding any of the items in Appendixes B, C and D?

CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP — DIVISION III RULES TEST

Scott Nichols (Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts): I move we place NC-10 on a roll-call vote.

[The motion was seconded.]

There is concern that the penalty is too severe for this action.

My concern is that this should be a secondary violation, and we are potentially putting people on probation for something that they may not be able to control in some cases.

Many of us deal with a lot of part-time coaches.

The spirit of the rule certainly is to have people take the test. But my concern would be that to have a test that people have to take and not pass has a penalty so severe.

Mr. Fry: Thank you. Are there any other proposals to be broken out at this point?

We are going to vote on the full package without No. NC-10. Then we will come back and consider 10.

This will be a paddle vote to approve all of the appendixes with the exception of No. 10.

[The appendixes were approved with the exception of NC-10.]

We will now consider No. 10. Are there any more comments from the floor on No. 10?

Does someone from the Membership Committee want to make any comments on the gentleman's request regarding No. 10 and provide any clarification or context? Are there any other comments or questions regarding No. 10?

Chris Martin (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin): I am a member of the Division III Membership Committee.

Speaking about NC-10, this is a condition of membership and you may recall that we adopted the administration of the rules test last year.

The committee put this forward to clarify the penalties and to outline the process for administering the rules test.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): The sense that I got was that people are really not clear on what the ramifications of this are.

I think this requires further explanation from somebody. If we vote this down, what does it mean? If we vote it in, what does it mean?

I don't think the alternatives have been very well explained because I got the sense that people aren't exactly sure what the ramifications of this particular proposal are.

I think it begs further explanation.

Mr. Fry: Let's take another shot at this.

Could someone from the rules committee possibly come up and walk us through this? Maybe we can ask Jay to talk about what this is and what the ramifications are of voting it down.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): From a legislative standpoint, last year this body adopted at the 2007 Convention Proposal No. 10 that required the rules test.

At that time, it was not specified what the penalties were for failure to adhere to those guidelines of taking the test on an annual basis.

As a result, the penalties were simply linked to all other membership penalties and would have been dealt with in the same manner.

NC-10 addresses that oversight and identifies what the penalties are for failure to adhere to the rules test requirements.

From a practical standpoint, the rules test is an ungraded exam. The individuals must complete the rules examination on a yearly basis.

Mr. Fry: I hope that will suffice.

Are there any other questions about that? Do people want some more information? Just give me a sense.

Timothy Shea (Salem State College): What is the alternative if this does get voted down? What are we back to?

Mr. Jones: Last year, when Proposal No. 10 was adopted, the rules test requirement was simply identified as a condition and obligation of Division III membership.

As such, failure to complete that requirement links to the other conditions and obligations of Division III membership and would go through that penalty structure.

Louise McCleary (Elms College): Will the staff monitor each institution and give us a warning if one of our coaches has not taken this, or will the institution have to self-monitor?

Mr. Jones (NCAA Staff): Let me first address Ms. McCleary's question about monitoring, and then I will blend that into the other inquiry.

The test is done electronically. As a result, the administrators on the institution's campus have an electronic report of who has and who has not taken the examination.

It is up to the institution to determine if all of the required individuals have taken the examination.

With respect to the penalty structure, under the way the provision was drafted before Noncontroversial 10, it would simply default to a standard secondary violation.

Those penalties could then be forwarded to the Membership Committee.

However, as a failure to adhere to the rules test requirement, it would simply be a standard secondary violation that would need to be reported through the regular infractions process, as any other violation would.

Mr. Fry: Are there any other questions?

Hopefully, with those clarifications we are ready to vote.

[The motion to exclude NC-10 in the Program appendixes was approved, 175-243-13.]

NC-10 will be referred back to the Management Council for further discussion.

With that, I believe all the appendixes have now been adopted.

Finally, we are going to vote to adopt the Convention Notice and Program.

[The Convention Notice and Program were approved.]

AGENDA AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Permit me now to review today's agenda and timetable.

The original agenda was published on the Web site, but as we discussed yesterday, it has been modified by the Presidents Council as follows:

First, we will consider our 10 roll-call proposals — Nos. 2 through 11 — and any related amendments.

Then we will consider the five proposals in our general grouping — Nos. 12 through 16.

We believe the voting process will take no more than an hour-and-a-half.

Second, we will elect our new Management Council members.

Third, we will open the window of reconsideration for the morning votes. We will handle the roll-call and non-roll-call votes separately, if necessary.

When we finish with reconsideration at approximately 9:45, we will begin our final round of discussion regarding membership growth and structure.

As we discussed yesterday, that discussion will take place in this room as a group as a whole. We anticipate that that discussion will last approximately two hours, but it could last longer if you wish.

We believe we will finish all of our work by noon, but there is no official deadline, so we have plenty of time.

Finally, we will receive a brief report regarding the drug-education testing pilot.

This is an important program, and you should be informed regarding this progress.

All in favor of approving the agenda please raise your paddle. Thank you. Any opposed? Thank you.

[The agenda was approved.]

I want to thank members of the Convention Planning Subcommittee. The subcommittee met several times during the past year to help craft our meeting agenda and to be sure that it is responsive to membership feedback and interest. You are enjoying the fruits of their labor right now.

Please keep our Convention format content and time in mind when you receive and complete the post-Convention evaluation form.

The committee relies on your feedback to help make the Convention a positive experience for all of us.

The subcommittee is chaired by Tim Gleason, the commissioner of the Ohio Athletic Conference. The other subcommittee members are Brad Bankston, the commissioner of the Old Dominion Athletic Conference; Christyn Chambers, assistant director of athletics at Swarthmore College, David Currey, Chapman University, Val Cushman, executive assistant to the president at Washington and Lee University; Jone Dowd, senior woman administrator at Catholic University; Danielle Drews, director of athletics at Russell Sage College; Dan Fulks, the faculty athletics representative at Transylvania University; Holly Gera, at Montclair State University; John Gregor, faculty athletics representative at Washington and Jefferson College; Kayla Hinkley, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee representative from the University of New England; Fredina Ingold, Penn State University, Altoona; Tobey Herzog, director of athletics at Wabash College; Lynn Oberbillig, director of athletics at Smith College, Kathleen Owens, the president of Gwynedd-Mercy College; and Miriam Pride, the president of Blackburn College.

Would the subcommittee members please stand and accept our thanks for their wonderful work this year? (Applause)

I also would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Presidents Council and the Management Council for their very hard work during the past year. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with members of both Councils. The great working relationship between these groups has served Division III very well.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge the Council members who are completing their terms of service at this Convention. Outgoing members of the Presidents Council are Peggy Williams, Ithaca College; David Beckley, from Rust College; and Miriam Pride from Blackburn College.

The outgoing members of the Management Council are June Dowd, Catholic University; Val Cushman from Washington and Lee; and Steven Suggs from Stevens Institute of Technology.

These individuals have spent literally hundreds of hours of their personal and professional time meeting their very important responsibilities of representing you in our governance structure.

Please join me in thanking them for their leadership, dedication and commitment to Division III. (Applause)

I would also like to acknowledge those who serve on the NCAA governance structure beyond the Presidents and Management Councils. We are truly a membership association with over 130 standing committees and many other special committees. It is only from the hard work of committee members that the business of the NCAA can be accomplished.

If you have served on any NCAA committee during the past year, please stand and be recognized. (Applause)

There are more of you out there. Thank you for your work on behalf of the NCAA and your commitment to the Association and to Division III.

If you are interested in committee service, I urge you to contact members of the Nominating Committee and staff, who will be happy to discuss opportunities to serve in more detail.

There are two groups in particular that assisted the Councils during the past year that I would like to mention.

One is the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group. This group helps to ensure that a president from every Division III conference has an opportunity to assist the Presidents Council and Management Council with their leadership responsibilities and work with fellow conference presidents to address important athletics issues at that level.

The other group is the members of the Virtual Focus Group. We have asked the Virtual Focus Group members for feedback on several important issues during the past year, especially related to membership growth and structure.

Their feedback has been very valuable to the Management and Presidents Councils. Would the members of the Presidents Advisory Group and the Virtual Focus Groups please stand to receive our thanks? (Applause)

The final group I would like to acknowledge is those who have hosted NCAA championship competition during the past year.

Championships do not take place without a great deal of hard work by many individuals at the host schools.

This hard work results in a quality championship experience for our student-athletes.

If you were on the staff of a school or conference office that hosted any round of an NCAA championship during the past year, please stand to be recognized. (Applause)

Thank you.

It is now time to consider our various legislative proposals.

Following tradition, to lead us through the proposals we will have the chair of the Division III Management Council, my colleague, Val Cushman.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Valerie Cushman (Washington and Lee University): Thank you, President Fry, and good morning to everyone.

I would like to thank a number of people in the room, but the folks we have not yet thanked are the people in front and to my right and left who are our incredibly talented folks at the NCAA office. I want to thank them for their support and help on our behalf for all of the hard work they do. Thank you. (Applause)

I know you all want to be intently focused on the legislation we will discuss this morning.

I also know that one of our dear friends promised potential libations this morning. You may be looking over your shoulder to see if they have yet arrived in the back of the room. I will tell you this, if they do arrive, the dais will quickly empty and run to the back of the room, and that will be a first sign that they are here.

We are now ready to consider our proposed legislation. We will consider a total of 15 legislative proposals and related amendments. These are Proposals Nos. 2 through 16 in your Convention Notice and Program.

Proposal Nos. 2 through 11 make up the Presidents Council's grouping. We will begin with these proposals and conduct roll-call electronic votes for those proposals and any motions related to them.

We will vote on those proposals in the numerical order that we approved earlier this morning.

Please remember the editorial corrections appear in the Convention Program. Also note that several questions and answers appear in the Q&A document that was attached to the recent Division III newsletter and included in your Convention registration packet. These cover just about every proposal.

In addition, the Councils recently approved interpretations and proposed parliamentary rulings or took action that affected a few of the proposals.

Those interpretations and actions appear in the handout distributed to you yesterday.

Just as we did in yesterday's forum, we will attempt to call your attention to all the information, the editorial corrections, the questions and answers and Council action and interpretations when we consider each affected proposal.

Also, please note that the sponsors have withdrawn Proposals 11 and 16. As I begin, I would like to remind you of a couple of points of order. For the interest of the court reporter, please state your name and institution when you are recognized at one of the microphones.

Also please remember that delegates are limited to addressing each proposal twice, not counting answering any questions posed to them by other delegates.

Finally, I would like to review a couple of parliamentary issues. Both involve a motion to cease debate, commonly referred to as "call the question."

Robert's Rules do not permit an individual delegate to cease debate simply by walking to the microphone and shouting out "I call the question."

Rather, a motion to cease debate or a motion to move the previous question must be formally moved and seconded.

This is a nondebatable motion that requires a separate vote and a two-thirds majority for adoption. If that motion is adopted, then we move immediately to vote on the underlying proposal. If the motion to cease debate is not adopted, debate continues on the underlying proposal.

One more point. The chair considers it unfair for an individual to move to cease debate or call the question immediately after he or she has made several comments regarding the merits of the proposal. In other words, if you want to move to cease debate, you should not engage in debate on the merits of the proposal as a part of your motion. If you do so, the chair intends to rule that motion out of order.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL GROUPING

We are now ready to consider our Presidents Council's legislative grouping. We will begin by considering Proposal No. 2.

This proposal was discussed in the Q&A document.

RECRUITING — SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS — PRIVATELY OWNED CAMPS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAMPS — EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

Marcia Keizs (York College, New York): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal updates the exams and clinics legislation in order to allow institutions to operate camps in a more practical manner. It also allows Division III staff members to work at privately owned camps without concerns regarding who might be employed as co-workers at these camps.

Current legislation prohibits prospective student-athletes from being employed at an institution's camp or clinic and prohibits institutional staff members from being employed at a privately owned camp, clinic or coaching school at which prospective student-athletes are employed.

This proposal eliminates these restrictions.

Proposal No. 2 permits staff members at Division III institutions to be employed at privately owned camps or clinics even if those camps or clinics also employ prospective student-athletes.

However, the camps or clinics must be open to the general public and cannot give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade.

These stipulations deter personnel from working at elite-level camps and gaining a recruitment advantage.

Additionally, the proposal allows greater employment opportunities for prospective student-athletes and increases the available pool for institutional camps and clinics by allowing institutions to employ prospective student-athletes subject to certain guidelines.

In keeping with the prohibition against extra benefits, the prospective student-athlete must be paid at a rate commensurate with the going rate for similar services.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 2.

Del Malloy (Salve Regina University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 2.

The modern structure and the logistics of operating a camp or clinic have changed dramatically over the years.

Camps and clinics are more prevalent and more encompassing than in the past.

Preventing an institutional staff member from serving in any capacity is unnecessarily restrictive and bureaucratic.

Likewise, prohibiting a prospective student-athlete from being employed at an institutional camp is not realistic and places an unnecessary burden on institutions attempting to staff camps that have become larger and more comprehensive over time.

Proposal No. 2 recognizes the changing nature of camps and clinics, yet retains important stipulations to deter coaches from working at elite-level, privately owned camps and gaining a recruiting advantage.

Based on feedback received after the debate of noncontroversial Proposal No. 2 in 2007, it is clear that the camp and clinic legislation should be updated based on the current practices of Division III institutions.

Examples that were expressed on the Convention floor last year included prospects who were employed as cooks, dorm monitors and in other roles in camps and clinics.

Unless we adopt these proposed changes, those practices would be violations.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 2.

[Proposal No. 2 was approved, 425-13-2.]

RECRUITING — PUBLICITY — PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE'S VISIT — ADMISSIONS OFFICE EXCEPTION

Chris Graham (Midwest Conference): As commissioner of the Midwest Conference, I move Proposal No. 3.
[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, no definition exists for the term publicity in the Division III Manual. As such, the term is left open to staff interpretation.

With regards to Bylaw 13.10.1, "publicity" has been interpreted to include the listing of a prospective student-athlete's name by the admissions office welcoming them to campus.

For admissions offices that strive to maintain a personal and an inviting approach to campus visits, the current interpretation of publicity prohibits them from publicizing a student-athlete's name among those of other prospects.

This restriction stands distinctly in contrast to part of the Division III philosophy statement that reads: "Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body."

This should also hold true for the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, allowing admission offices to apply the practices consistently for all parties.

Whether admissions offices on Division III campuses are aware of this interpretation or not, they need to be cognizant of all visitors to campus who are invited by their athletics department members so their names will not appear in public with those of general prospects at the current time.

The expectation for this type of coordination between the departments and individuals is dubious at best.

At the same time, admissions offices are left in the delicate position of explaining to visiting prospective student-athletes and their parents why their name was not listed among the other remaining prospects visiting campus at the same time and/or under the same circumstances.

I would like to state one more time that this proposal is an admissions-centered exception by language and intent. Related bylaws still prohibit the involvement of athletics departments in any activity that is not conducted by the admissions offices for prospects in general.

On behalf of the Midwest Conference, I urge the membership to adopt Proposal No. 3.

Richard Flynn (Springfield College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 3.

Proposal No. 3 seeks to allow our institutions' admissions offices to publicize the visits of prospective student-athletes in the same manner visits of all prospective students are publicized.

Admissions offices currently are not permitted to do this, but rather the admissions office must exclude prospective student-athletes from the publicity it routinely creates for other prospective students.

Because this publicity is being done through admissions, this exclusion seems unnecessary.

This proposal is consistent with the central tenet of Division III as stated in the philosophy statement to assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body.

Likewise, prospective student-athletes should not be treated differently from prospective students.

This proposal only permits institutions to do what is already being done for prospective students generally and does not create special circumstances for prospective student-athletes.

Athletics departments would still not be permitted to publicize visits of prospective student-athletes on their own, rather this proposal only permits admissions offices to publicize visits of prospective student-athletes and only with the caveat that it is done in the same manner as it is done for prospective student-athletes generally.

This is consistent with the Division III philosophy and makes good sense for our division.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 3.

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): As a member of the Division III Management Committee, I echo the words of Dick Flynn and speak in support of Proposal No. 3.

The current legislation has been in our Manual since before divisional federation, and though the legislation might be necessary for Division I institutions, it seems overly restrictive for Division III.

This proposal intends to address this concern and not differentiate between the prospective student-athlete and the prospective student generally.

This change is consistent with Division III philosophy and is the practical way for Division III institutions' admissions offices to recruit students generally.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 3.

[Proposal No. 3 was approved, 424-5-1.]

RECRUITING — DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal seeks to prohibit athletics staff from using text messaging, instant messaging and any other forms of electronic communication other than e-mail for the purpose of recruiting.

These forms of communication have become overly intrusive and negatively affect the athletics recruitment process intended for Division III institutions.

The use of these forms of communication has no limits and virtually removes the parents and high school coaches from the recruitment process.

Since text messaging and other forms of communication are now permissible, many athletics staff use these tools to contact prospective student-athletes at any time of the day or night.

Some athletics personnel feel compelled to make these contacts to keep pace with their colleagues.

Typically, these messages are received by prospective student-athletes with no knowledge by the prospective student-athletes' parents or coaches.

This is not consistent with Division III.

This proposal specifically prohibits all forms of communication except telephone calls, written correspondence, e-mails and faxes.

A return to these more traditional forms of communication will ensure that parents and coaches are most likely involved in the recruitment process.

Further, by prohibiting text messaging and instant messaging, athletics staff won't be pressured to have constant contact with prospective student-athletes because such contact will not be permitted.

As a result, prospective student-athletes won't be constantly inundated with messages and can put the focus on more important tasks as they complete their high school years.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 4.

Jeff Baldwin (Centennial Conference): I would like to echo the previous speaker's comments and also speak on behalf of the member institutions of the Centennial and the New England Women's and Men's Athletics Conference, which originally co-sponsored the legislation.

This legislation, which applies only to institutional athletics personnel and those acting on their behalf comes from the Centennial Conference SAAC and has the support of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Our students complain that text messaging was so intrusive that sometimes it bordered on harassment.

They have asked that we be held to a higher standard when it comes to communication and we have listened. There is a sentiment that the recruiting process should keep up with the times and be current with the latest and greatest technology.

To agree with their position is to ignore our student-athletes who asked us to eliminate text messaging from the recruitment process.

We ask for your support for Proposal No. 4.

Patty Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): I am a member of the Division III Management Council.

I rise in support and urge you to support Proposal No. 4.

As the advisor to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I am pleased to let you know that Proposal No. 4 was also recommended by them.

The intent was to define communication in our current recruiting practices.

The SAAC noted that the informal nature of electronic communications such as text messaging and instant messages is not a professional means of communication between a coach and a prospective student-athlete. As administrators, we have a duty to make sure that recruiting is conducted in a professional manner.

Prospective student-athletes use text messages and instant messages as a means of informal communication with their peers.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes that such communication methods are not consistent with the desired relationship between a coach and a student-athlete.

Currently, coaches use text messages and instant messages to communicate with prospective student-athletes at all hours of the day and night, creating an atmosphere in which other coaches have to do likewise in order to keep up.

Proposal No. 4 would help get the recruiting process back on course. It would prohibit all forms of electronic messages with the exception of e-mail.

Coaches would have to revert to more traditional forms of communication. The student-athletes believe that traditional communication is important in creating an atmosphere consistent with Division III principles.

In addition, high school students would not be misled about the coach's student-athlete relationship.

By doing so, we set the tone for a smooth transition from a prospect to a team member.

Finally, as you know, Division I considered a possible reversal of this same legislation. It is important to note that they did not and this standard will continue to apply in Division I recruiting.

Again, I urge you to join the student-athletes in support of Proposal No. 4.

Chuck Sack (Neumann College): I am a member of the FAR executive committee.

I come before you today in support of Proposal No. 4.

Texting from coaches has become a persistent intrusion of the daily lives of recruited prospective student-athletes.

Additionally, they and their families have the burden of cost associated with these transmissions.

We consider this a student-athlete welfare issue and urge your support of Proposal No. 4.

Peggy Williams (Ithaca College): I am the FAR at Ithaca College. I have a confession.

I fell for this legislation at the FAR annual meeting.

I felt really good about it. We talked about text messaging and how it intruded on people's lives and our students.

I have since reconsidered after going to our coaches meetings and finding out our coaches use text messaging.

The more seasoned coaches don't even know how to text message.

One of our younger coaches said, "I go to an event, watch a prospective player perform, send a text message at the end saying, 'I saw you play. I will call you tomorrow.'"

This doesn't sound terribly intrusive.

The advantages are, as stated by others, the cost. Parents will be more involved and DI and DII have such restrictions.

Let's deal with the last first.

When my kids were younger, they wanted to go to a party and used the rationale, “All of my friends will be there.” They didn’t get to go.

Just because DI and DII have a problem doesn’t mean that this is a problem for DIII recruited athletes.

Secondly, where are the data? President Myles Brand talked about making decisions based on data, but yet I see no data in this proposal.

If you were to look at the Pew Research Center report published last January, you will find some data on how teenagers use technology.

These data compare Generation X, which is 18- to 25-year-olds, to Generation Z, and for the more seasoned people in the room, the Baby Boomers.

First of all, half of our teenagers sent or received text messages in the past day.

Number two, teenagers embrace new technologies and depend on their mobility to communicate.

Number three, teenagers use text technologies to keep in contact with their parents and to ask for advice.

One of the advantages of removing text messaging, according to the proposal, is that it will allow parents to be more involved.

I don’t know how many of you have dealt with “helicopter” parents, but that is enough data for them.

Finally, in a student paper that I read at the end of last semester, 40 percent of teenagers today use text messaging as their primary form of communication.

The conclusion is this legislation is not needed. We can’t legislate proper behaviors. If we did, we would need a forklift to carry the rules book.

Drew Ash (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am an Ithaca College baseball student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 4.

While prospective student-athletes routinely communicate through text messaging, instant messaging and social networking sites, these means are intended for personal communication with friends and family.

Coaches using these same means of communication deformatize what should be a professional relationship.

Prospective student-athletes expect communication from coaches to reflect proper communications standards of higher education.

For example, most would agree it is inappropriate for a professor to recruit an academic elite prospective student via text messaging.

The same standard should apply to athletics recruiting.

Some argue that texting provides convenience not available through other means of communication.

This attempt at efficiency sacrifices the professional relationship maintained through telephone calls and e-mails.

Institutions have successfully recruited students without the use of text messaging, instant messaging and social networking sites for many years. Student-athletes are confident that coaches and institutions can effectively recruit student-athletes without using these means of informal communication.

We urge you to support Proposal No. 4.

Alan Runge (Concordia University, Texas): I have a question of clarification and a comment.

Do you accept friendly amendments to this proposal from the floor at this point?

Ms. Cushman: Our bylaws do not provide for that.

Mr. Runge: I think the spirit of this is to avoid abuse of the privilege and the technology involved by coaching staff and other administrators.

As the student-athlete at the microphone before me just pointed out, that that is the point — that these technologies are often considered personal and that it is like the yes means yes, and no means no debate in other arenas.

The student should also have the ability to say I do not want this or I would like this.

**AWARDS AND BENEFITS — ACADEMIC AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES
— SIMILAR SERVICES**

As common courtesy in communication and dialogue, I would have proposed that the word “sent” in the first paragraph of 13.02.9 be changed to “initiated,” whereby if a student initiated a question they should be able to get a response in that declared path — whether it be text, phone, voice, e-mail, et cetera.

But the coach should not be able to initiate it.

That would be abuse of that technology. That is my comment.

Ms. Cushman: Thank you for your comments.

Like any proposals that are adopted, the appropriate Membership Committee will take a look at your concerns and we will address them.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): Without further comment, I call for the question.

Ms. Cushman: Thank you.

The question has been called. That is a nondebatable motion. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cushman: That is a nondebatable motion. You now vote through the electronic methods. It is a roll-call proposal, so it will be a roll-call vote.

[The motion to call the question was approved, 396-35-7.]

Ms. Cushman: We are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 4.

[Proposal No. 4 was approved, 362-72-2.]

**AWARDS AND BENEFITS — ACADEMIC AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES
— SIMILAR SERVICES**

John Krogman (University of Wisconsin, Platteville): On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

The current application of the word “such” in NCAA Bylaw 16.3 stipulates that support services provided to student-athletes must be identical to those available to students generally.

In effect, this interpretation suggests that institutions and/or conferences are precluded from providing any type of educational programming that is not identical to or open for all students to attend or partake in.

In other words, the content and delivery of programming for student-athletes in topical areas such as leadership, time management, diversity, motivation, study skills, careers and sportsmanship must be identical to what is provided for students generally or open for all students to attend.

Somewhat ironically, these restrictions also apply to much of the student-athlete’s programming now being facilitated and encouraged by the NCAA itself with the assistance of funding provided to conferences through the conference grant program.

Furthermore, many conferences and institutions routinely provide educational programming for their Student-Athlete Advisory Committees that is not open for students generally and thereby impermissible under the literal interpretation of the rule.

While the NCAA itself conducts leadership conferences that are attended annually by and intended solely for student-athletes, the conduct of such programming for student-athletes on your campuses, if not open to the general student body, is impermissible.

By substituting the word “such” with “similar,” this proposed modification would simply permit institutions and/or conferences to provide educational and academic programming that is similar in nature to the programming available to students in general.

For example, if an institution provides or makes available career counseling services to its students generally, it would be permissible for its student-athletes to participate in a career counseling seminar that recognizes those attributes such as leadership, teamwork and time management that we all espouse to be key components

of the student-athlete experience.

Consequently, we ask for your support for a modification that remains consistent with the spirit of the current legislation, but yet allows for the content and delivery of the programming geared more specifically to the needs and interests of our student-athletes.

Paul Tribble (Christopher Newport University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak against Proposal No. 5.

The Presidents Council believes that student-athletes should not be provided with academic or other support services that are separate or different from what is provided to our general student population.

As we have heard today, part of our Division III philosophy statement indicates that student-athletes should not be treated differently from other members of the student body.

Our current policy allows for programming to be given to student-athletes as long as it is open to all students.

This approach allows our student-athletes to be more fully integrated into the campus community, and we believe that is important and indeed central to the philosophy of Division III.

For those reasons and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge a vote against Proposal No. 5.

Jack Ohle (Wartburg College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against Proposal No. 5.

By allowing student-athletes to have academic and other support programming exclusive to them, this proposal could create a division between student-athletes and students generally.

This is not in the best interest of Division III institutions and is in fact contrary to our division's philosophy stating that student-athletes should be treated no differently than students generally.

I have some further concerns about the precedent that this change in legislation would establish with respect to academic services, such as the possibility of exclusive tutoring centers being created for student-athletes. That type of programming is not something that the Council feels is in the spirit of the Division III philosophy; therefore, this is not in the best interest of Division III. Because this legislation creates the possibility for such exclusive programming, the legislation is not good for Division III.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 5.

Kyle Waterstone (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am a swimming and diving student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 5.

Student-athlete integration is paramount in Division III.

Granting services exclusive to student-athletes will result in student-athletes becoming segregated from the general population.

We recognize that student-athletes have busy schedules that often make it difficult to receive academic support and services during normal hours.

However, student-athletes are not the only students who have time commitments outside the classroom.

Commitments such as work-study, participation in student-led organizations and Greek life also require substantial time.

We believe that if accommodations are made for student-athletes, they should be made for all students.

We urge you to oppose Proposal No. 5.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): The FAR association supports our student-athletes in urging that this proposal be defeated, primarily on the grounds that this would appear to be a move toward existing policies in Divisions I and II.

Bill Gehling (Tufts University): I would like to request a clarification. If we presently have a leadership training activity for our captains, are we in violation of the NCAA rules?

Ms. Cushman: This is one thing I have learned along the way. Even if I think I know the answer to the question, I never answer it in public.

With that, I am trying to buy some time for the folks to my left.

Mr. Gehling: Of course, we don't have one, but I think maybe some others here may have.

Jeff Myers (NCAA Staff): Our leadership training that is exclusive to student-athletes would be impermissible under the current rule.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): For the record, this microphone is not too short for me. I just want to point that out.

Part of the reason for us to come forward with this particular proposal was again not to look at the possible extremes or abuses that could occur that were cited by some of our esteemed colleagues.

It was really to look at some of the educational programming that is out there and available to our student-athletes.

One such example was just cited that is impermissible.

When that statement was given, I sensed a groan from a lot of people because I suspect a lot of you didn't even realize that that was impermissible.

Plus, there is a whole laundry list of exceptions that are made for educational programming of certain types, but not programming of other types.

Let me share with you some exemptions.

You can provide massage and relaxation techniques to your student-athletes and not to students generally, but you cannot do time management exclusively for your student-athletes versus students generally.

That is just one example.

Part of the problem is the array of ambiguity, the extent to which certain decisions are being made in terms of what is appropriate and what is not appropriate.

I hear this constantly going back to the Division III philosophy — don't treat student-athletes differently than students generally.

Again, we have all sorts of exceptions even in just the area of educational programming where that happens on a day-to-day basis.

The intent of our legislation was simply to say if those services are generally available to students on your campus, you can do a program that addresses the specific needs of your students and the interest of our student-athletes without having to invite the student body generally.

You hear all sorts of excuses or rationale or ways around the rule to go ahead and post a sign somewhere where students are not going to see it, but says it is open to everybody. That is ludicrous.

If the underlying thing here is that it should be open to all students generally, then let's put some legislation in that says what does that mean?

Ms. Cushman: I am going to turn to Mr. Myers for clarification about what is indeed permissible.

Mr. Myers: Based on the previous comments, I want to provide clarification of what the permissible expenses are and where they come from.

Bylaw 16 points out two areas where some of these expenses are permitted — specifically, health, medical-welfare-being expenses and programming put on by the national and conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): That was my clarification overall, because I think that many of us have had longstanding CHOICE/Life Skills programs in place where we have had programming that has been directed to our student-athletes.

If you look at their health and well-being, that is a fairly large area overall. We do a lot of programming, whether it be to help them to be more effective leaders as our captains or whether we do programs with time management, general health and wellness.

That clarification is helpful, because many of us have had programs ongoing for many, many years.

This legislation does not need to be passed for us to continue to do what we have been doing for years.

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): I don't want to open a can of worms here, but another point of clarification is about the NCAA speaker grants that are provided to institutions.

Are these monitored to make sure that they in fact are being offered in many cases to more than just student-athletes?

Ms. Cushman: That is a good question.

They indeed are monitored to ensure that the NCAA doesn't fund something that is not approved by our legislation.

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): They are two different grants — one being the Division III Strategic Initiatives Program.

Yes, we do monitor those applications for the permissibility of the expenses.

However, sometimes there are changes in the uses of the fund between the time of application and the time the funds are actually expended by the institution or the conference.

There is an initial attempt to monitor for permissibility of the dollars at the time they are approved by the NCAA office.

Dana Harmon (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Can you give us definitions again of activities that are permissible under well-being and what is not permissible under well-being?

Mr. Myers: I don't think we can provide a list of what is and what isn't.

There are so many programs and services out there that you have to determine if it is a health and well-being program.

You have to look at it on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Karner: I hope I am not out of order, but let me respond to something that was said on the dais about the exceptions that are made for programs that you provide to your conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The problem is that very same programming, if you transfer it to your campus, is then impermissible in many cases.

That's part of the rub here. You can do things; and again, the NCAA leadership conference is a classic example.

If you did that very same programming on your campus, it would be impermissible if you had it only for your student-athletes.

They cite the exceptions that are made. Somebody mentioned the CHOICE/Life Skills program.

According to the document that I have in front of me, that must be open to your general student body or it is impermissible.

This is where all the confusion results and all the ambiguity comes into play here.

Ms. Cushman: The conference exception is indeed noted in the Q&A document, but I might turn to the legislation staff to talk about funds that are transferred to a campus.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): We have worked with various commissioners regarding programming offered through the conference SAAC.

There is legislation related to permissible expenses for conference SAAC programming.

When we have worked with those commissioners, they felt that the programming was permissible. It was programming offered on a conference-wide level to student-athletes at multiple institutions, and the funding was coming through and controlled by the conference office in those cases.

Peggy Williams (Ithaca College): I am a member of the Presidents Council.

I want to speak against this proposal.

Services such as career counseling, academic support and others should be planned and scheduled in a manner to serve all students — student-athletes or students.

We heard about that in the admissions conversation a while ago.

If institutions are not currently serving student-athletes, this provision of support services in general, then I say those institutions should step back and say how can we serve all students — athletes, student-teachers, part-time students and full-time students?

We have many categories of students who need to be served effectively in the broad range of support services that we offer.

Creating a separate set of programs and services is not the way to go.

It creates separation and program duplication and increases our expenses. If we step back and look at things like student government clubs that have to be open to all and lectures offered by academic departments that have to be open to all, we know not everyone goes.

I do not see the burden placed on us when we say if we have a program directed at captains, for example, and

it has to be open to all, not everyone else is going to come anyway.

There is no evidence to show that that is a burden.

I urge you to oppose this proposition.

Dana Harmon (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Although we weren't given examples of well-being, can we get a definition of well-being?

Ms. Cushman: I could give my personal definition, but we will wait for the official interpretation.

Mr. Myers (NCAA Staff): It is not legislatively defined in that there is not a specific definition of what health and well-being is, but it is linked to the mind and body of the student-athletes.

For programming that would benefit that, you have to look at those instances and see if that would be appropriate and see if it would fall under that. It would be defined as a medical or health issue.

[Proposal No. 5 was defeated, 215-215-8.]

From the Floor: I will be brief, I promise. When we try to get this reconsidered, which side is the prevailing side?

Georgana Taggart (College of Mount St. Joseph): It would be the "nays" because the motion failed.

Ms. Cushman: Thank you. It is now time for us to consider Proposal No. 6. It also appears in the question-and-answer document.

Mr. Karner: Before we do that, I want to go on record that the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference probably had the first proposal ever that ended up in an absolute tie.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — GENERAL PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS — MAKE-UP CONTESTS DURING CONFERENCE POSTSEASON EVENTS

Mr. Karner: On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move adoption of Proposal No. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the close of the conduct of conference postseason events, it becomes necessary to occasionally suspend and resume competition on a succeeding day or days as a result of factors outside of the control of the conference, such as inclement weather.

However, under the current rules it is not permissible for institutions to extend their declared playing season and complete contests that have been suspended and are used to determine a conference champion and/or automatic qualifier to the NCAA championship.

For example, if the final day of the conference postseason tournament were to be suspended due to inclement weather, it is not permissible under the current legislation to complete the tournament on a succeeding day to determine the conference's automatic qualifier unless all the participating institutions are counted for this possibility in the calculation of their respective playing and practice seasons.

In other words, institutions are expected to reduce their playing seasons in anticipation of inclement weather that may or may not ever occur.

Under the scenario, institutions are faced with either systematically reducing their playing seasons across all sports or take a calculated risk as to which sports are more likely to experience weather issues.

For those of us located in northern climates, it is almost as likely for us to experience a snowstorm in February as it is a rainstorm in May.

The only other proposed alternative is for the conference to apply for a waiver from the NCAA, a remedy that is impractical given that such a waiver would inevitably be considered after the fact since the events that typically cause the suspension of a conference tournament or championship are unpredictable and outside the control of mere mortals, such as conference commissioners.

Since it is highly unlikely that a conference commissioner will be able to make immediate contact with an NCAA staff member on a Saturday night in February or in May at the precise moment a decision has to be made, it puts conference commissioners and their conferences in an untenable position.

What are the ramifications if the waiver request is subsequently denied?

Very simply, this proposed amendment to Bylaw 17.1.7-(b) would allow for the extension of the playing season, which in most cases would be a one-day extension in those instances in which to cancel their suspended contests are necessary to determine a conference champion and/or automatic qualifier to the NCAA championships.

If adopted, the automatic qualifier and champions of our conferences are more likely to be determined on the field of play, a remedy that is clearly in the best interest of our student-athletes and far more preferable than allowing for these all-important determinations to result from the acts of nature and the inflexibility of our rules.

James Harris (Widener University): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak against Proposal No. 6.

In the opinion of the Presidents Council, it is not necessary to legislate a change to our current playing-season regulations when sufficient and appropriate avenues already exist to make up a contest in unique or significant circumstances.

The language of Proposal No. 6 is unnecessary. It does not clarify the circumstances under which a make-up contest would be permitted other than to set a time parameter on that make-up contest itself. A make-up situation should be an anomaly.

It is extremely difficult to anticipate all the circumstances under which a make-up contest is appropriate.

Therefore, a legislative change is not the appropriate method of dealing with the situation.

In those cases in which weather or other situations develop that suspend or cancel contests, there is a waiver provision available for conferences to use.

The Administrative Review Subcommittee is best equipped to consider a make-up request as it arises and issue a waiver accordingly.

Moreover, the membership should be aware that the Presidents Council, the Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee and the Championships Committee have recommended that the NCAA staff and the Administrative Review Subcommittee exercise greater flexibility than it has in the past when reviewing these waivers.

For these reasons, I encourage you to vote against Proposal No. 6.

Ms. Cushman: As a point of information, in consideration of discussion from the membership on this topic of access to the staff for short-term waivers on a weekend environment, they have agreed and spoken with the commissioners about the ability to have 24/7 access to the staff as needed to address the waivers.

Robert Leighton (University of New England): I am the faculty athletics representative of the University of New England, and past president of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association.

I stand to state FARA's support of Proposal No. 6.

The FAR recognizes that this proposal could allow for a longer playing season by a few days at most.

However, the alternative of scheduling the season tournament a week earlier to allow make-up days during the season only forces compression of games into four available weeks.

This proposal is a better alternative. It has a minimal impact on class time and for most student-athletes will have a positive effect.

The FAR encourages your support of Proposal No. 6.

Steve Larson (Northern Athletics Conference): The Northern Athletics Conference is a co-sponsor of this proposal.

One of the areas we are concerned with is situations in northern states where we are dealing with snow, ice storms and that sort of thing. They hit us as recently as this past winter in which a conference championship game forced the visiting team to travel and deal with more missed class time.

It dealt with the team that had to drive up and arrive a day earlier, which not only caused more missed class time, but obviously budget considerations and cost considerations in order to get the game in.

A number of people, including myself, trying to get to the game were in accidents or went off the road and couldn't even attend the game.

All this was in order to get it in at the prescribed time.

Had the one day been available to play the game later, everything would have been fine.

In addition to what has already been stated, the welfare and safety of our student-athletes is paramount in this as well.

Kristen Hall (Bard College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 6.

Proposal No. 6 unnecessarily legislates the possibility of extending the playing season.

Institutions and conferences presently have the means to adjust their schedules to anticipate a need for make-up contests.

For example, under the current legislation, institutions may begin practice on a different day at the start of the season in order to accommodate a potential make-up scenario.

Additionally, a waiver can be filed with the Administrative Review Subcommittee for those unusual situations when an unforeseen circumstance necessitates a make-up contest.

Because the NCAA staff and the Administrative Review Subcommittee have now been directed by the Presidents Council to exercise greater flexibility when reviewing these waivers to ensure that they hear requests for waivers in a timely manner, the Management Council believes the waiver process is preferred to legislating an exception.

Since these suitable options currently exist to manage the circumstances anticipated by this proposal, a legislative change is unnecessary.

For these reasons, I urge you to cast your vote against Proposal No. 6.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): I speak on behalf of my conference in supporting this proposal.

Currently, we shorten the season by a day for every student-athlete in some sports just on the chance that lightning, a power failure or a snowstorm or other unwarranted condition causes us to bump our championship final back into Sunday.

This is the last thing we want to happen. We need to reschedule officials, hotel rooms, facilities and other headaches.

But we do so in order that the championship can be determined by the student-athletes, not some bylaw in our conference constitution.

We appreciate the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's support of this proposal and also the faculty athletics representatives.

Yes, we can get a waiver on a Saturday night from an NCAA staff member on a cell phone if we are fortunate enough to reach them, but is that the way to do business?

This proposal represents common sense, and it is the fairest and best way to treat our student-athletes.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a question for the members at the table.

How does this affect the contractual agreements with ESPN for selection shows and things like that where we have to have all the selections in by such a time on a certain date?

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): The proposal puts limits on the extension of the game and when the game can be rescheduled. It has to be completed before the championship selection period.

Robert Lewand (Goucher College): I call the question.

Ms. Cushman: The question has been called.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cushman: Again, this is a nondebatable motion.

[The motion to call the question was approved, 421-21-2.]

[Proposal No. 6 was approved, 312-133-1.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST DATE

Sean Sullivan (York College, Pennsylvania): On behalf of the CAC, I move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, which changes the first permissible contest date in basketball to November 15, would provide a consistent preseason practice period each year.

Thus, practice may start October 15 and contests may begin November 15.

This simplification and standardization of the contest start date significantly benefits both the institutional

and student-athlete experiences in a number of ways.

Number one is academic welfare. By opening your contest playing season on November 15, many conferences will be able to avoid playing three conference games in one week.

This congested schedule as currently structured creates unnecessary missed class time. This proposal, if passed, would help our student-athletes to stay in class each week.

Two is physical welfare. The added flexibility of not having to play these three games in one week will reduce the physical toll that the current format creates.

Three is financial gain. While the length of the playing season, and this is important, would remain at 19 weeks, the less congested winter schedule would allow institutions to avoid bringing back and paying for teams on campus at such an early date. This may save institutions money.

Four, equity. Division III prides itself on providing equitable experiences without set contest start dates, which wipe out the overlap among all seasons. Basketball is being singled out.

Other winter sports, such as wrestling and swimming, may begin their contests as early as they choose.

Yet, there is a concern about basketball contests moving perhaps a handful of days, limiting a fall athlete's ability to play two sports.

Baseball and softball contests frequently begin in mid-February, which is the middle of the conference basketball season.

Without defined contest start dates in all sports, we are walking out of step with one of our guiding principles, equity and experience.

Lastly, pure gain. Regardless of how the other two divisions handle this issue, there is much to benefit Division III by passing this proposal.

Academics will be improved with less missed class time. A student-athlete's physical health will be supported further with a less-congested schedule.

A student-athlete's ability to play two sports will remain unchanged, especially in comparison to other sports and their contest start dates.

Coaches will still be able to schedule a scrimmage before November 15 because the exceptions will not change.

An athletics director may be able to reduce winter break housing and feeding costs due to the scheduling flexibility that a November 15 contest start date would provide.

Lastly, conferences will be able to use the autonomy we all enjoy by imposing their own contest start date should they choose to deviate from this potential ruling.

Both the CAC and SUNY athletic conference strongly urge the membership to support Proposal No. 7.

James Moseley (Franklin College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak against Proposal No. 7.

This proposal would extend the basketball season for the purpose of trying to maintain consistency with Divisions I and II.

This is not in the best interest of Division III.

Our division should not be influenced by the start date or season length within other divisions.

By extending the season, the Presidents Council is concerned that the proposal may lead to other requests for season extensions and further impact a student-athlete's opportunity to participate in more than one sport.

This extension of the season is not in the best interest of Division III.

The change in this case is unnecessary because the current legislation is appropriate.

For these reasons, I encourage you to vote against Proposal No. 7.

Kay Whitley (Sul Ross State University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against Proposal No. 7.

This proposal will lengthen the playing season for basketball student-athletes and could discourage those student-athletes who wish to participate in more than one sport due to the potential overlap in sports schedules.

It is important that a broad-based athletics experience continues to be an option for all student-athletes.

Currently, the Division III rule in this area is not difficult to apply and allows for a first contest date on the

Friday immediately before Thanksgiving each year.

It is not necessary for Division III to adjust its start date based on possible changes that could occur within Divisions I and II.

For these reasons, I encourage you to vote against Proposal No. 7.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): I am looking for a special guest who was to join me in song, but before that person arrives at the microphone, let me mention the difficulty that I had in coming to this year's Convention.

I received a call before coming to the Convention from the NCAA indicating that my credit card did not work and that my hotel reservation for the Convention was not there.

I said to them, "How could that be?"

I had just gone online and ordered some of the most expensive T-shirts from the NCAA Web site, T-shirts at \$49 apiece.

Now, if Myles Brand is concerned about the television contract and the shortfall, I am sure he will make that money up with the mark-up on the NCAA equipment that we are receiving.

The other one had to do with winning the ECAC all-worldwide travel trip for two, all expenses paid, to the Rose Bowl this year. I mention that because I am hoping they will give me one next year by giving them a commercial advertisement here.

I mentioned to Dan Dutcher that I had won the trip and he said that is wonderful, but the NCAA wants to go one step farther. They wish to supply to me an all-expenses paid trip to Pasadena next year at the same time as this Convention. I said, "Dan, there is no game or parade." He said, "Don't worry about it, you will miss the crowds."

Well, I see my special guest has not arrived, Dolly Parton.

Friday night I went to the Grand Ole Opry and I had the good fortune to sit beside Dolly Parton.

Ms. Cushman: Excuse me. I urge you to move toward the merits of the proposal on the floor.

Mr. Nelson: Well, my point has something to do with the legislation.

While Dolly and I had a conversation, and while I was there, Steve Bamford from the ECAC came by and said to me, "Are you going to sing again at this Convention?"

Dolly said, "I would love to sing along with you."

But evidently she did not come. But she did promise that she would be at next year's Convention, and she wants to make it a trio.

She suggested that she, along with I and President Fry have a songfest. We are going to call ourselves the Don Quixotes.

I asked her what song she would like to sing. The song she recommended was that great hit in the '60s, "Breaking Up Is Hard To Do."

Now, getting to the legislation ...

Ms. Cushman: Thank you.

Mr. Nelson: I am not calling the question.

As a member of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, the coaches overwhelmingly are in favor of this legislation.

As a long-time coach, I could often see the frustrations of our players in playing only a few games in the first semester, and then having to play the bulk of the games in the second semester.

As the first speaker mentioned, there are definite benefits to it relative to the budget and class management, and it does not, as mentioned by the presidents, extend the playing season.

The playing season begins October 15, so it does not extend our playing season at all. It does provide us the opportunity to play games in a lesser frequency, eliminating missed class time.

Timothy Shea (Salem State College): As a current coach of women's basketball and having coached for 27 years, I stand to oppose this legislation.

In fact, I would prefer shortening up the preseason practice over extending the time we could play games.

I think the start date right now suffices.

Jerry Boyes (Buffalo State College): Buffalo State is a supporting sponsor of this proposal. I speak in sup-

port and echo the comments made by my colleague, Sean Sullivan, from the Capital Athletic Conference.

The intent of this proposal is to standardize the start time and provide flexibility in scheduling during a compressed time of the semester to reduce missed class time at a critical time toward the end of the fall semester.

This legislation does not lengthen the basketball season.

It does not affect the exceptions allowed in Bylaw 17.5.3.1 regarding scrimmages and exhibition contests.

The Division III question-and-answer guide produced by the NCAA Interpretations and Legislative Committee does a good job addressing the issue.

I speak in support. It does not affect the issue regarding the multi-sport athletes.

This is in effect with the current way the basketball season exists.

We support Proposal No. 7.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): Is basketball the only sport that revolves around a holiday as it relates to when it can start?

When Thanksgiving moves forward or backward depends on how compressed or decompressed the season comes. Is basketball the only one?

Jeff Myers (NCAA Staff): It is the only sport that revolves around a holiday that triggers its starting date.

Mr. Kaiser: Then with that in place, I think the November 15 regular start date makes a lot of sense. I support it.

[Proposal No. 7 was adopted 248-185-7.]

ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY — REQUIREMENTS

Peggy Williams (Ithaca College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 8.
[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal relates to the issue of men practicing with women's teams.

It limits the participation of male practice players to the traditional segment and to one practice per week.

Further, the proposal stipulates that the number of male practice players in that one practice shall not exceed half of a typical starting unit, rounding up.

For example, it would limit the use of male practice players in basketball to three men, once a week in the traditional segment.

You may recall that at last year's Convention the proposed legislation related to male practice players was referred back to the Management Council for further review.

According to a survey sent to the Division III institutions as part of that review, a majority of institutions favored some restrictions on the use of male practice players.

This reflects the attitude of our membership that women's athletics have developed significantly in the past 25 years, and it is no longer appropriate to rely heavily on the use of male practice players.

This proposal does provide teams the opportunity to use male practice players in a limited manner to supplement women's practice on an occasional basis.

Those conferences or institutions that would prefer a total prohibition on male practice player use, can certainly make their own restrictions to do so.

Our philosophy statement gives paramount importance to providing equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and giving equal emphasis to women's and men's sports.

This proposal furthers that cause.

To more closely realize our philosophy and to protect and enhance participation opportunities for female student-athletes, I urge you to support Proposal No. 8.

Lynn Oberbillig (Smith College): As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 8. Also, as a native of the State of Iowa and a caucus-goer, I know I can convince you to support this issue.

The proposal will regulate the use of male practice players so that participation opportunities for female student-athletes are protected.

I have two basic reasons for the use of male practice players.

One, many of you have smaller squad sizes and you use them to augment your squads; or two, to gain a competitive advantage by practicing against faster, taller players.

Both of these are legitimate reasons for male practice players, a fact we can't deny.

However, it is the unrestricted use of male practice players that has the adverse potential to reduce practice opportunities for women, something that all of us agree we would not want to do.

President Williams referred to the survey last year and in fact we found that 40 percent of the schools reported using male practice players. Fifty-six percent of those schools wanted restrictions, and the restrictions that people wanted were both to limit the number of players and to the frequency of use.

The Management Council and the national SAAC wish to address those issues. How many of you sat here last year and didn't know what your coaches were doing with regard to male practice players? Now you know.

It is this unknown that drives us to support this legislation.

We don't always know what our coaches are doing, and if you are like me, you are generally the last one to know. To protect the practice opportunities for our female student-athletes, it would be wise to support these restrictions.

For some of you, this legislation may not be restrictive enough. I say to you this legislation is more restrictive than the status quo, which allows for male practice players every day of the week all season long.

Please do not cast a nay vote simply to make a statement. We need your support. I urge your support of Proposal No. 8.

John Krogman (University of Wisconsin, Platteville): I urge you to vote "no" on this proposal to curtail the use of male practice players.

Let me be very clear about this. Our institution believes there should be a total ban on the use of male practice players. We believe there should be no reduction in opportunities for women, and we intend to propose legislation at the next Convention to outright ban the use of male practice players.

In addition, we believe this puts an undue administrative burden on our already short-staffed administrators.

We urge your opposition to this and we urge your support next year for a total ban on male practice players.

Michelle Jorwic (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am a soccer student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 8.

The competitive nature of women's sports allows female student-athletes to use their talents and skills to compete at the highest intercollegiate level.

When the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee was first confronted with the issue of male practice players, it was apparent there were many strong and varied opinions on the issue.

Despite this, one thing was clear from the discussion. The majority of student-athletes were in favor of restricting the use of male practice players in some capacity.

This proposal also allows for practice opportunities for female student-athletes by providing flexibility in the opportunity to use male practice players.

This includes circumstances in which roster size is limited. It is important to note that was a unique opportunity for women's athletics to use male practice players.

A similar opportunity is not available for men's athletics teams. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is passionate that there are alternatives to male practice players that have yet to be exhausted.

As a committee, we have full confidence that Division III coaches will explore creative ways to promote optimal levels of performance.

This proposal protects the Division III philosophy, allowing female student-athletes to excel at the highest possible levels of their respective sports without compromising the integrity of women's athletics.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee would like to acknowledge that an institution or conference may provide more stringent restrictions for use of male practice players if it deems appropriate.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges you to support Proposal No. 8.

Beth Bass (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): I am the CEO of the Women's Basketball Coaches Association. On behalf of the WBCA membership, and particularly our members of Division III institutions, I

urge you to defeat this proposal.

We continue to believe that this is not an issue that belongs in the legislative process. If institutions believe their coaches are abusing this practice, then it should be addressed on an individual basis.

The WBCA is committed to continue to focus on educational resources to ensure that our coaches are conducting their classrooms in a manner that ensures appropriate and ample practice time for all female student-athletes.

The use of male practice players in Division III is just not about an issue of development, but a need for additional bodies on a daily basis because of the appropriate emphasis on education and student-athletes' inability to attend practices due to academic studies.

I thank you for your time and for your vote to defeat this proposal once and for all.

Mr. Shea: I want to point out a couple of results from the survey taken in 2007 and distributed by the Management Council. There were 337 people who responded.

In addressing the issue of protecting practice opportunities for females, there were a couple of results.

There is largely no change to how the starting student-athletes are used when male practice players are used.

Secondly, for the most part, the role of non-starting student-athletes went unchanged when male practice players were used.

I oppose this legislation. My question really has to do with why do we need more restrictive legislation for an issue that has little or no effect on most of our campuses?

Patty Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and the proud advisor to our hard-working and dedicated national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in support of this proposal.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is committed to providing equitable practice opportunities for female student-athletes.

This proposal protects these opportunities for women by limiting but not eliminating the involvement of male practice players.

By restricting the participation of male practice players in women's team sports to one practice per week during the traditional season, with no more than half of the starting unit being male, it does provide some protection to the student female athletes for participating in our athletics program and helps to ensure that the female student-athletes are not relegated to the bench as their teammates scrimmage against the males.

For this reason, I am in support of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's commitment, and I ask you to support this proposal.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): I am the FAR and former vice president of FARA.

The FAR association supports our student-athletes in urging adoption of this proposal. I think the arguments have been well-stated.

I would respond to one comment, and that is we are concerned about the use of male practice players being reduced.

I think we are concerned about them being used at all. The only argument I would add is that I have four daughters, all are fortunate that they are all females, and my present wife and a former wife who was a female, and a previous former wife who was a female.

I like to say I have been married 25 years, but that is to three different women. Nonetheless, as the father of daughters, I think there is a philosophical argument and that is the statement that we are making to our young female athletes that the only way they can get better is to compete against males.

This statement that I hear about the use of male practice players probably concerns me more than the loss of practice time for our female athletes.

The FAR and I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Lynn Oberbillig (Smith College): I want to re-emphasize to those of you who think we shouldn't do this at all, that we really need your vote this year to reject this.

If you would like to propose legislation next year to abolish the use of it, you still have that option. But to not vote for this year, you let it continue on unrestricted.

There's a second point I would like to make. As you add men in eligibility, they become part of your gender-equity count.

For those of you who have an imbalance to begin with, we are still not providing enough opportunities for our women.

The latest Costa and Carpenter Report came out with thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands short of the same number of opportunities for men.

Again, I urge your support for the unrestricted use of male practice players.

Debra Townsley (Nichols College): I have a daughter who played with men in soccer to improve her skills as she was growing up.

I have a son who played ice hockey with a Canadian women's Olympian to improve his skills as a goalie in high school.

We are legislating in only one direction. If there are abuses, female student-athletes need to learn to have a voice.

Unfortunately, this will happen in their lives in the workplace.

Our job is to offer men and women the best opportunity to improve, not only in athletics but in educational opportunities, to find their voice to challenge when something is wrong.

I don't think that we should be legislating for the few abuses that may exist.

I don't want to see this as a gender issue that only goes one direction. It only goes one direction in that it only addresses team sports and not individual sports.

I oppose this legislation.

[Proposal No. 8 was approved, 233-206-17.]

PERSONNEL — CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS-SAFETY TRAINING

Gregory Campbell (Carthage College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 9 provides additional health and safety monitoring for student-athletes by specifying that at least one individual who is certified in first aid, CPR and automatic external defibrillator be present at every athletically related activity that involves student-athletes.

The individual must also be familiar with the institution's emergency plan activation policies.

This proposal is in response to a survey of NCAA death claims showing that 83 percent of all non-vehicle-related deaths occur during practice and conditioning and that 60 percent of deaths were due to heart-related conditions.

An individual certified in first aid, CPR and automatic external defibrillator or AED use could make the difference between life and death for a student-athlete.

A similar version of this same proposal was discussed at the 2007 Convention and later tabled based on questions that were raised on the floor.

Those questions have been addressed in the question-and-answer document. Because of the important nature of this proposal, it is being brought forward for vote again this year.

This legislation will establish some consistency among Division III institutions in the monitoring of practices for athletics activities so that we can feel more certain that Division III student-athletes are safe as they pursue their athletics endeavors.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 9.

Christine Lewis (Vassar College): I am a student hockey athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 9.

This legislation directly promotes the safety and well-being of student-athletes.

The committee strongly believes that individuals certified in AED and CPR and first aid should be on site and responsible for ensuring the safety of student-athletes at any required and mandatory scheduled team physical activities.

The intent of this legislation is to provide a safe environment for student-athletes during required scheduled team physical activities.

The committee understands the practical concerns raised by the original proposal and required individual workouts such as running and weight lifting that are not included in the new proposal.

The committee's main goal is to have individuals in positions to respond in case an emergency occurs during the most rigorous and intensive activities, which include team conditioning, practice and contests.

We also believe it is imperative for each Division III campus to be prepared for emergencies.

This legislation requires the institution to have an emergency activation plan firmly in place in order to appropriately respond to situations that arise on the field of play.

While there are costs associated with training and health equipment, we are confident that institutions can comply with this legislation through grants and other initiatives.

We recognize that many of you already abide by this regulation. However, this legislation will provide a minimum benchmark and ensure that student-athletes have the same level of protection at each and every campus.

A practice without a policy is just not enough.

Written legislation that creates accountability to the safety and well-being of student-athletes is paramount.

Since last year's Convention, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee actively sought feedback about this proposal and received overwhelming support from student-athletes.

This proposal makes a commitment to ensuring the safety of all Division III student-athletes.

We urge you to support Proposal No. 9.

Rudy Keeling (Eastern College Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 9.

This proposal is vital to the health, safety and well-being of our student-athletes.

Making sure that there is a certified individual present in practices, competition, and strength and conditioning sessions, makes sense and is the right thing to do to promote the safety of our students.

There are two important things to note regarding some of the opposition that has been expressed to this proposal.

First, some have questioned why it is necessary to certify in AED use, but not require the purchase of an AED machine.

The reality is that AED certification is an included part of the modern CPR certification, so that requirement was not adding anything additional that will not naturally happen upon being certified in CPR.

While this proposal does not require that every coach in an institution be certified, certainly many of the application issues that could be raised would not be a concern if all coaches were certified.

The certification of all coaches will not be a requirement and makes the application of this proposal very easy to meet.

Costs should not be a deterrent to passing this proposal.

Multiple agencies offer first aid and CPR training nationwide.

Additionally, institutional staff members can become instructor certified and certified staff members at a reduced cost.

Additionally, this is not an actual cost. First aid certification is good for three years and CPR certification is valid for one to two years.

Moreover, Division III grant funding may be used to offset the cost of certification and any health and safety equipment the institution may choose to purchase.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Kelly Morrison (Sweet Briar College): I strongly support this, but I am a little disheartened that we have said that we are not going to require institutions to have AEDs available at all of our practices.

I am hoping that all of us who don't have them on our campuses will look this over, and I strongly urge you to get them now that this legislation is hopefully going to be passed.

You are giving coaches the training, but you are not giving them the tools to do their job in case an emergency should arise.

Debra Townsley (Nichols College): I am again going to speak out against this piece of legislation, as I did last year.

This is not reflective of my or our desire to not provide the safest environment for our students.

In fact, we already do that at Nichols College.

However, the issue is the wording. As was suggested in the green hand-out of questions and answers, I did indeed consult our legal counsel.

There are language issues in this piece of legislation that are problematic.

For example, it says that at least one individual has to be employed, but in parentheses it says a volunteer. Volunteers are not employed.

Second, it says not including student employees unless they are members of the athletics staff.

At Nichols, this isn't the case, but I do know other schools that have trained students as employees for their campus. These students would not be included in this piece of legislation.

Third, how do you define athletically related activity?

If something happens when the student is stretching before the coach who is trained gets there, we would be liable.

As my legal counsel pointed out, plaintiff personal injury lawyers are creative lawyers.

This is the way the National Athletic Training Association handbook reads as guidelines. Also, this says AED training, but we aren't legislating that you have to have AEDs.

That would be questioned. My lawyer had a list of issues that would make our institutions potentially very liable under this piece of legislation if anything happened on our campus.

We do care about students. That's why we do what we do.

We also need to care about our institutions, our alumni, our faculties and our staff.

We cannot have bylaws that put our institution at such risk, in my opinion. In fact, another president in our conference pointed out that on pieces of legislation, and he felt all pieces of legislation, but in particular on something like this that has a lot of risk associated with it, that there should be legal counsel review from a member's perspective to make sure that the language protects our institutions.

In conclusion, this is a perfect example of why we need legal counsel review of the language before we vote, especially in high liability situations.

The spirit of this piece of legislation is good intentioned, but the risk is too great as it is presented for our institutions in my opinion.

Robert Leighton (University of New England): I am the faculty athletics representative at the University of New England and immediate past president of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association.

I stand to state FAR support of Proposal No. 9.

This proposal, originated by the Division III national SAAC, will require that all Division III institutions provide baseline expectations of medical care, which includes having a responsible person certified in CPR and AED present at required physical activities of the student-athletes.

Our student-athletes should expect this medical coverage and it should be provided.

We encourage your support of Proposal No. 9.

Ms. Cushman: Having given the folks to my left time to consider the question about external legal review and NCAA counsel review, I will turn to Jay Jones to comment.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): As far as legal review from the national office, our general counsel's office does review all proposals on a yearly basis.

In addition, they have an external group of advisors who represent general counsels from various institutions around the country who review various proposals.

Based on the conversations at last year's Convention on a similar proposal, we asked that that occur in this case.

Instead of using my own language as far as what the feedback was, I direct your attention to the question-and-answer document.

I will quote the feedback and language from legal counsel at the NCAA: "The analysis of possible liability

for a particular institution would involve a review of practices employed at the institution and the particular jurisdiction. Thus, each institution should consult with its counsel to determine any liability concerns resulting from this legislation or the current guidelines in the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook.”

Travis Feezell (Macalester College): I think if we were to take a poll in this room, the response would be overwhelming that we are in favor of supporting the health and well-being of our student-athletes.

That is not at issue. That vote would be unanimous.

This is not an issue of student-athlete well-being.

I will echo Debra’s comments. It strikes me that not only do we open ourselves up as institutions to a higher level of liability exposure, but more clearly this is legislation that should be left to the institutions.

It is up to our institutions to manage risk appropriately on our campus at some level that takes this away.

This is something that should not be legislated.

Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I have a question of clarity. I want to use track as an example.

If we have track practice where we are out in our stadium on our track, we have a group of students with a coach in our field house and another group with a coach in the weight room, and another group with a coach on our practice field doing throws, do we need to have a person certified at each of those places?

I am giving you time to think about this one.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Ira, for the question.

Actually, there was time for our counsels to think about those questions, and I would remind the delegates of the interpretation that was passed out during yesterday’s issues forum on the parliamentary procedures document.

Based on that document, the activity would require a certified individual to be on site and responsible for ensuring safety of student-athletes at any required physical activity scheduled for the team.

As such, if the scheduled activities took place in different buildings with multiple members of the team, based on this interpretation, you wouldn’t need a certified individual in those locations.

Kayla Hinkley (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am a field hockey and lacrosse student-athlete.

The national SAAC would like to re-emphasize that many of you already abide by this regulation.

However, this legislation would provide a minimum benchmark and ensure that student-athletes have the same level of protection at each campus.

Again, a practice without a policy is not enough. Written legislation that creates accountability to the safety and well-being of student-athletes is paramount.

Institutional policy does not protect student-athletes who travel to away games.

[Proposal No. 9 was defeated, 176-256-12.]

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATIONS — ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS — USE OF PROVISIONAL MEMBERS TO MEET CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS

Candice Murray (North Eastern Athletic Conference): On behalf of our conference and the North Atlantic Conference, I move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the North Eastern Athletic Conference and the North Atlantic Conference, I would now like to move amendment-to-amendment 10-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposed legislation and this amendment-to-amendment is requesting accommodations for conferences that have provisional members in order to maintain NCAA automatic qualifiers in those sports where automatic qualifiers were already in place.

Access to championships is one method by which the student-athlete experience is enhanced.

The membership has already voted once to ensure this access for conferences in transition with approval of the grace period.

This proposal amends Convention Proposal No. 10 by recognizing that the third- and fourth-year provision-

al institutions' results count in regional rankings for postseason play by the NCAA Championships Committee.

We believe the third- and fourth-year members should also count toward the seven required institutions for conferences in determining automatic qualifiers because these members are meeting all NCAA regulations and are a vital member in the conference structure.

This amendment also only allows conferences to use these institutions in order to maintain an existing automatic qualifier rather than earning a new qualifier.

This legislation will allow several conferences, though not many, to continue to provide a home for provisional institutions while also maintaining vital experiences that have rightly been earned for our student-athletes.

We ask the membership to be emphatic to the minority and to allow these provisions as you have done so in the past for similar causes or similar scope.

The North Eastern Athletic Conference and the North Atlantic Conference urge your support.

Ms. Cushman: As a reminder, we are now focusing on the merits of Proposal No. 10-1. Are there other comments on that amendment-to-amendment?

John Nazarian (Rhode Island College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak against the amendment-to-amendment.

Our current automatic qualification process was changed to allow a grace period for conferences that were struggling to maintain their membership and to meet the AQ standards.

The grace period should be sufficient enough to address the concerns within these proposed changes.

This proposal is an attempt to further mold the automatic qualification legislation to assist one or two conferences in their current situation that will fall short of the requirements for earning the AQ, even with the grace period.

We must not continue to water down the integrity of the automatic bid process.

It is important that conferences meet the criteria established with active members of Division III that would be able to represent that conference in the championship if they won the conference bid.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 10-1.

Charlie Wilson (Olivet College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against amendment-to-amendment 10-1.

While the third and fourth year of provisional institutions do count in regional rankings as the rationale for this amendment suggests, the simple fact remains that these institutions also are still not eligible for championship participation.

As such, they should not count in the formula for the AQ bid.

To allow schools to count toward the minimum that are not even eligible to participate in the championships simply waters down the competition for that conference and therefore sacrifices the integrity of the automatic-qualification process.

As an example, why is it reasonable for "Conference A" to have seven schools all fighting for the championship bid when the proposal would allow "Conference B" to have fewer?

It makes the selection unbalanced and unfair for those conferences that meet the current standards for the AQ bid.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 10-1.

Leonard Tyler (Maine Maritime Academy): I speak in support of 10-1 on behalf of my institution and on behalf of the members of the North Atlantic Conference, of which Maine Maritime Academy is a member.

As many of you know, in recent years we have seen the formation of new conferences that has resulted in a shift in the composition of other conferences, many of which were well-established conferences.

The North Atlantic Conference has already seen such a shift. It has tapped our membership from 13 to 11 to 8.

As a result, this well-established conference has found itself scrambling in order to add member institutions in order to meet scheduling commitments and to keep its conference automatic-qualifying status.

This problem is especially acute for conferences in remote areas; conferences that do not have the access to many NCAA Division III members.

As many of you who have ever been to Maine or Vermont where members of the North Atlantic Conference hails, you will know what remote means.

It seemed to us that just as institutions must be given the autonomy to make decisions concerning conference authority, it is in the best interest of its institution and its student-athletes that conferences should be afforded the same level of autonomy in considering candidates for admission for membership.

By enacting 10-1 and allowing well-established conferences such as the North Atlantic Conference to consider candidates for memberships that are currently in NCAA provisional status and have them count toward automatic qualifiers will allow these conferences to select new members based on fit rather than possibly forging short-term alliances with NCAA-qualified institutions that may not be as good of a fit simply to maintain automatic-qualifier basis.

We believe some of the fallout and shifting of conferences that we are experiencing today is a result of conferences that form with little consideration to the challenges of large geographical areas, different philosophical perspectives, a balance in sports sponsorships and athletics resources.

Amendment 10-1 will encourage conferences to make long-term decisions that we feel will be in the best interest of the conference, its members, and in our view in the long-term best interest of the NCAA.

Susan Speece (Penn State Berks College): I am the chair of the presidents council for the North Eastern Athletic Conference.

I want to echo my esteemed colleague's comment from the North Eastern Conference.

All of us have the potential of having shifts in conferences.

New members to the NCAA are invited in, and these kinds of shifts are particularly happening on the East Coast, with new conferences being formed by members from existing conferences.

As my colleague stated, we are scrambling for new members.

We are not asking in 10-1 for new AQs. We are asking to maintain the AQs that we have with members we have invited in by being inclusive to the new members to the NCAA who fit within our thoughts and fit our membership.

I encourage your positive vote on 10-1.

Joseph Burke (Kueka College): Kueka College is a member of the North Eastern Athletic Conference. I stand in support of Proposal No. 10-1.

It does not create any additional advantages in gaining automatic qualification.

It only allows conferences that have automatic qualifications some additional bridge time to bring their additional conference members in the later stages of the probationary process to be counted toward automatic qualification.

I would like to again emphasize that no probationary schools will become eligible for NCAA postseason play under this new proposal.

The proposal will not take any additional existing opportunities away from other DIII members.

Let's take the necessary action as an example of this proposal.

The NEAC has a conference philosophy of welcoming new NCAA members into our conference.

In fact, over the last few years, we have taken several new NCAA members into our conference and now have about 25 percent of the conference in the various NCAA processes of probationary membership.

However, as our colleagues have mentioned, over the past two years conferences in the northeast part of the United States have experienced a great stage of fluidity.

Our conference has suffered from that fluidity due to the great geographical distance that exists between our institutions.

Therefore, in the last two years, this fluidity has put us in a situation where these conference members in the later stages of their probationary status will be needed to bridge this gap in some sports for a very small period of time beyond the waiver period.

We encourage your support because it is in the best interest of our student-athletes across our conference who have been playing hard throughout the years of their college experience and would lose the opportunity to continue to participate in NCAA postseason tournaments during the interim time after the waiver period and before the probationary schools reached the final stage.

I would like to emphasize that I believe if this proposal was passed it would further create an atmosphere of openness and receptiveness for those new members that will be coming in to the NCAA.

I urge your support for Proposal No. 10-1.

Jerry Chaplin (Messiah College): I call for the question.

[The motion was seconded.]

From the Floor: Excuse me. There was someone waiting at a microphone before the motion to call the question. May that person speak?

Ms. Cushman: Once the question has been called, we need to vote on that motion before any further discussion.

As a point of clarification, if you want to hear from the person who was standing at Microphone 5, you will need to defeat the motion.

This is nondebatable. There was a second. Again, this is a proposal to cease debate.

[The motion to call the question was approved, 307-75.]

The motion carries. That means that we will now consider Amendment 10-1.

[Proposal 10-1 was defeated, 185-252-7.]

We'll now carry forward with consideration of Proposal No. 10.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATIONS — ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS — USE OF PROVISIONAL MEMBERS TO MEET CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS

Candice Murray (North Eastern Athletic Conference): The North Eastern Athletic Conference and the North Atlantic Conference now wish to withdraw Proposal No. 10.

Ms. Cushman: It is my understanding if there is no one who objects to the sponsors' withdrawal, then the motion will be withdrawn.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION — ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS — SINGLE-SPORT CONFERENCES

Louise McCleary (Elms College): On behalf of the sponsors, we wish to withdraw Proposal No. 11.

Ms. Cushman: That concludes our consideration of the proposals in the presidents grouping. Thank you. We will now proceed with the proposals in the general grouping.

As a reminder, we will use the voting unit to decide these proposals, but will not produce roll-call votes.

Our next proposal is No. 12. This proposal was also discussed in the question-and-answer document.

ELIGIBILITY — SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS — ONLINE COURSES

James Moseley (Franklin College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow institutions to determine whether online courses taken at other institutions should be considered for purposes of academic standing and satisfactory progress.

The current interpretation on the use of online courses does not allow institutions this discretion.

Currently, they are treated in the same manner as correspondence courses, which the current legislation does not permit institutions to use toward satisfactory progress or academic standing.

This proposal is consistent with the Division III principle that satisfactory progress should be determined at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the uses of these academic courses for all students.

This proposal does not impose greater restrictions upon the institution, nor does it grant student-athletes an

advantage not available to students generally.

The legislation merely permits the institution to determine a student-athlete's academic standing on the same basis as it does for all students.

If institutions currently don't recognize credit earned from online courses at other institutions, this legislation does not now require the institution to do so; rather, it presents the option to institutions that do recognize credits earned online from other institutions to also recognize them for the purposes of student-athlete eligibility.

This puts the administration and academics where it belongs — in the hands of institutions.

This is consistent with Division III philosophy.

In addition to this proposal, the Presidents Council has directed the Interpretations and Legislation Committee to look at the Manual and make sure that there are no other academic-based restrictions that are removed from the authority of the academic officials at our respective campuses.

It is important that each institution have the authority to determine what constitutes good academic standing on their own campus.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 12.

Stuart Gulley (LaGrange College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 12.

An institution should be permitted to determine the academic standing of its student-athletes in the same manner it does for all students.

This is something that is spelled out in the Division III philosophy. This is a uniquely Division III concept.

Despite this, institutions are not currently permitted to recognize credit earned from online courses at other institutions to count toward academic standing or satisfactory progress if academic standing for all students takes into account such courses.

This proposal changes that and puts the determination of whether to use these type of courses back in the hands of the institution.

I also note that as a result of the discussions that led to this proposal, if you adopt this proposal, the Council will also use its authority to adopt noncontroversial legislation to put the determination of the use of correspondence courses and extension courses back in the hands of institutions and their general academic policies regarding these types of courses.

These changes are consistent with Division III philosophy that academic policy should be governed by the institutions themselves.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 12.

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): I am the FAR at Neumann College and a member of the FAR executive committee. I come before you today in support of Proposal No. 12.

This permissive legislation supports the autonomy of each institution in determining its academic policies for all students if its policies allow the inclusion of online courses taken at its institution or others.

In determining academic standing and satisfactory progress, student-athletes at their certifying institution should be able to have the same policies apply to them as well.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 12.

[Proposal No. 12 was approved, 424-12-2.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — TRADITIONAL SEGMENT — CROSS COUNTRY, FIELD HOCKEY, GOLF, RUGBY, SOCCER, TENNIS AND WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the WIAC, I move for adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

In selected NCAA fall sports, institutions are currently permitted to play their first contest September 1, or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

However, the current rules also stipulate that institutions are required to count back the 16 practice opportunities allowed for these sports from the first contest date, or September 1, whichever is later.

Consequently, institutions playing their first contest before September 1 are limited to fewer than the 16 practice opportunities that have been deemed appropriate in preparation for competition in these sports.

This proposed amendment will allow institutions that have a consistent number of practice opportunities from year to year, counting back from the first scheduled intercollegiate contest, even if that contest is scheduled before September 1.

This amendment will also result in considerably less confusion and misapplication of the current rule in those years in which the first contest may be scheduled before September 1.

Consequently, the WIAC urges your support of Proposal No. 13.

Kathleen Owens (Gwynedd-Mercy College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

This proposal clarifies current legislation regarding the traditional segment in specified sports.

In addition, it provides teams with the consistent availability of all preseason practice opportunities that have been deemed appropriate for preparation for competition.

Because it provides a clear and simple manner by which to apply the traditional segment legislation, Proposal 13 will result in less confusion than the current legislation.

Moreover, recognizing and working around calendar anomalies is not a novel legislative concept.

For example, elsewhere in Bylaw 17 our legislation makes adjustments for Labor Day weekend.

Proposal 13 does not extend the length of the playing season since the playing season remains limited to 18 weeks.

The proposal merely clarifies when you start the count of practice opportunities in order to determine the start date in these sports.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 13.

Lee McKinney (Fontbonne University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

This proposal allows institutions to have a consistent number of practice opportunities each year, regardless of when their first intercollegiate contest is scheduled.

The current legislation has caused some confusion from year to year and has at times resulted in institutions receiving less than the allotted amount of time for their preseason practice activities.

The simplicity of this proposal will reduce the confusion and misapplication of determining the start of these sports.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 13.

[Proposal No. 13 was approved, 413-29.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — COUNTABLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES — STRENGTH AND CONDITIONING COACH

Miriam Pride (Blackburn College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 14.

Proposal No. 14 provides clarification to current legislation and defines the standard that strength and conditioning coaches should be monitoring voluntary workouts for safety purposes.

This proposal requires that strength and conditioning coaches who are also members of the coaching staff of the athletics team must be available to monitor all student-athletes who are using the training facility when they are monitoring the workout.

The current legislation does not allow the strength coach to conduct the workout.

The legislation only permits the strength coach to monitor the workouts.

The proposal does not change this fact.

However, the proposal attempts to make it clear that a coach should not be solely monitoring their own team, as that seems to suggest that they are monitoring those workouts for reasons other than safety.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 14.
[Proposal No. 14 was approved, 426-16.]

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS — LEGISLATION — AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MEMBERSHIP — CO-SPONSORSHIP DEADLINE

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): On behalf of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, the American Southwest Conference and the Northern Athletics Conference, I move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention, this body voted to support an amendment put forth by the Presidents Council to require an increase in the number of institutions or conferences necessary to propose an amendment to the bylaws.

The intent was to ensure that there would be broader-based support of any proposal coming to the floor from the membership and to minimize the time spent in so-called special interest legislation.

This was a very reasonable adjustment.

In practice, however, it has proven to be a bit more cumbersome.

A survey of Division III conferences indicates that 80 percent of the conferences compete in the months of May and June. This is the time when most conferences consider potential legislative amendments based on the discussions at those spring meetings.

Preliminary proposals have also been shared after the Division III commissioners meeting in early to mid-June as a means of gaining support.

The logistics are that it is very challenging to see that the co-sponsorship from other conferences that are also currently meeting or have just met, and the prime time to share information on the proposal in-depth without conferences is a month or so prior to the co-sponsorship deadline at a time of the year when presidents, the decision-makers in such matters, are frequently on the road or on vacation.

To reconvene such a body for proposed, meaningful consideration on legislative issues is a substantial challenge.

This amendment simply proposes an additional change to the process by extending the deadline to September 1 to seek a co-sponsor.

Without a co-sponsor by September 1, the proposal would be automatically removed from consideration.

Additional time allows for more thoughtful consideration and removes the unnecessary barriers of the legislative process while still encouraging the special interest proposals.

We ask for your support of Proposal No. 15.

David Beckley (Rust College): I am a member of the Division III Presidents Council. I speak against Proposal No. 15.

There are several reasons that the governance structure opposes Proposal No. 15.

First and foremost, it will make it difficult for the various committees and Councils to review legislation in a timely fashion, as they would not know which pieces would receive sponsorship, and they are reviewing them in their fall meeting.

Secondly, we feel that the membership sponsor at this year's Convention has indicated the liability of a calendar that we approved a few years back.

Third, this change in calendar will have a negative impact on the publications and particular efforts from the national office.

The Presidents Council urges the membership to take a couple of years to offer this current structure before asking for voting on those cases.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 15.

Jone Dowd (Catholic University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against Proposal No. 15.

The rationale for this proposal seems to suggest that the only time of the year in which legislative concepts and proposals can be discussed is during the summer months.

In fact, these can be developed and dispensed at any point throughout the year.

As we have discussed in a previous proposal today, I am sure that there are some of you who have thought of other areas of legislation that you might like to change.

Why should they have to wait until the next summer to be discussed as this proposal seems to suggest?

Concepts should be discussed as they arise and that should happen on a year-long basis.

If those discussions are occurring throughout the year, it would mean that the current legislative time line would work appropriately.

This proposal causes issues with committees and Council preparation for the Convention. The Council feels that the legislation can be discussed and developed at any time throughout the year.

For those reasons, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 15.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I ask you to support this legislation.

A number of the concerns that have been expressed by the Presidents Council and the Management Council speakers point out a number of issues and arguments that I don't think hold weight.

The argument about discussion of legislation should take place throughout the year doesn't take into consideration that those discussions at the conference level more appropriately take place during face-to-face in-person meetings, and the scheduling of those meetings is wholly dependent upon the availability of the decision-makers of the institutions for there to be directors of athletics, women administrators, faculty and vice presidents and presidents of the institutions.

It is very difficult to bring those people together to schedule face-to-face meetings, and those meetings are set to include the leadership of our institutions.

To suggest that both meetings can occur at any time throughout the year really does not fly in the face of higher institutions in our conference operations.

Another point that has been raised is the difficulty of the governance structure to discuss potential legislation. The potential legislation would be on record by the July deadline and can be considered by the various committees throughout the Association.

The membership sponsorship of legislation is not that great, and once it is distributed among the committees and it would not present an undue burden in considering a piece of legislation that may or may not gain the appropriate sponsorship by the later deadline for co-sponsorship.

Finally, the difficulties that are cited by the governance structure in terms of the logistics are precisely the same difficulties that commissioners and conferences and member institutions face in putting together the appropriate level of sponsorship for these proposals in the first place.

I would point out that the staff resources available to the governance structure are far larger than the staff resources available to our member institutions and constituent conferences.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): Although my colleagues shudder to hear me say this, I am a member of the Management Council as of now. As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against Proposal No. 15 for various problematic reasons.

The work of the Division III committee and national office staff in preparing for the annual Convention is extensive.

This work centers on studying legislative proposals, providing legislative pieces and legislative publications, the question-and-answer document and others in working to develop amendments-to-amendments on the other key positions.

All this work is extremely important. It helps the membership to make informed decisions on those proposals and helps in correcting proposals that make the most sense for Division III.

Proposal 15 is a monkey wrench in this process.

It will mean the committees and the NCAA staff will be using it to do work on a proposal that may not receive sponsorship.

That is not beneficial to the committee or the staff. Therefore it is a step in the wrong direction for Division III as a whole.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose this proposal.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to echo some of the comments made by some of my fellow commissioners.

Like it or not, commissioners are the primary facilitator of the proposal process, at least as it comes from the membership.

As has been stated, with the current time line that is in place, that is difficult to seek co-sponsorship for legislation or consider co-sponsorship proposed by the conferences.

As Dick indicated, I find it fascinating that the rationale or part of the rationale given for opposition is there is a volume, and I quote, "of membership-sponsored proposals through the 2008 Convention."

By my count there were nine membership proposals.

So you might have one or two that may ultimately not obtain the co-sponsorship requirement by the September 1 deadline. That is imposing an incredible burden on our governance structure in the consideration of proposals?

They can have the proposal withdrawn in the time specified. It doesn't need to be spent. But that is the way it works.

I again strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Given the consideration of the proposal, it is not going to significantly burden the questions that have to be studied on this legislation.

Mr. Rasmussen: I have been a member of the governance structure and participated in the work of the various governance committees of the Association, and it is not unusual at all for those various committees to consider legislation that has been drafted but not yet approved for consideration by other committees within the governance structure and have taken a look at that potential legislation and to offer guidance or opinions on that legislation back to the rest of the governance structure.

The question is why should member-sponsored proposals be treated any differently in that regard and treated as potential legislation coming from the membership in the same way that the potential legislation is coming from other areas of the governance structure and are given consideration?

[Proposal No. 15 was approved, 294-145.]

Ms. Cushman: As we know, Proposal No. 16 has been withdrawn by the sponsors.

That concludes this morning's Presidents Council and general groupings.

Thank you for your attention and preparation for that very long business session.

Mr. Fry: As a reminder, after the break, after the election of the Council members, we will open the window to consider any of the proposals voted on this morning.

We will post roll-call votes out in the area in the hallway to my left.

I would like to take a moment to single out a group of individuals in this room who have worked so hard on the legislation that is in front of you.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strives to represent the many thousands of constituents. They are responsible for speaking for them and work incredibly hard in doing so. I want to thank them for their hard work on behalf of our Association. (Applause)

It is now time for us to take a break. We will reconvene at 11:35.

[Note: The delegates took a short recess.]

COUNCIL NOMINATIONS

Mr. Fry: We are ready to reconvene. We will come back to order.

Our first item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members.

If you recall, under the governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially solicits and selects Management Council nominations.

The Management Council and the Presidents Council reviewed those nominations, but the positions are ultimately filled by a vote of our membership during this session.

I believe we have the appointments. You should have received the slate of nominees with your registration materials.

To present the initial slate of nominees, I will call on the chair of the Nominating Committee, Sharon Beverly, the director of athletics at Vassar College.

Sharon Beverly (Vassar College): Thank you, President Fry.

The Nominating Committee wishes to thank the Division III membership for its interest in serving in the NCAA governance structure and requests your continued interest and support.

Since last year's Convention, the Nominating Committee has made appointment recommendations for nearly 100 vacancies. Currently, there are approximately 300 individuals serving on Division III committees and as Division III representatives to Association-wide committees.

Of those members serving on Division III committees, 62 percent are men, 38 percent are women, and 11 percent are ethnic minorities.

The Nominating Committee is committed to supporting the strategic goal of the NCAA by increasing the number of women and ethnic minorities who participate in the NCAA structure.

Please continue to nominate colleagues, and we encourage self-nominations as well. We estimate that over 95 percent of the nominations are self-nominations, and either type are easily submitted electronically and remain active in the system for two years.

If you would like to have more information about NCAA committee service, please contact Sharon Tufano, NCAA committee coordinator, at the national office.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the following slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council: The re-appointment of Lee McKinney, director of athletics, Fontbonne University; and the appointments of Joan Sitterly, director of athletics, State University College at Cortland; and Rita Wiggs, USA South Atlantic Conference.

Mr. Fry: Thank you, Sharon. The committee's nominees have been moved. May I have a second, please?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Fry: Thank you. Are there any other nominees from the floor? Seeing none, we can now use our paddles for this process.

[The slate of nominees was approved.]

I want to note that we have a new member of the Management Council who will be representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. He is Christopher Wolf of Nebraska Wesleyan University. Chris, thanks for doing this.

I wonder if all of our new Management Council members might stand to be recognized, and I want to again say we look forward to working with you. (Applause)

I also want to remind the delegates of our recent appointments to the Presidents Council. As you may remember, the members of that body are appointed by a vote of the Division III presidents and chancellors.

Our new members are Livingston Alexander, president of the University of Pittsburgh, Bradford; Walter Bortz, president of Hampden-Sydney College; and Katherine Hill, the president of Vassar College.

It is now time to resume our legislative agenda. Leading us again through this process will be Val Cushman.

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Ms. Cushman: Thank you again, John.

Our final legislative task is the window of reconsideration related to our roll-call and non-roll-call votes.

The window of reconsideration is now open for Proposals 2 through 16.

As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies and the proposal then is back before us for further consideration and another vote.

Finally, please remember that the vote on a motion to reconsider any of our roll-call proposals, Nos. 2 through 11, and any subsequent votes on them will require a roll-call vote since Proposals Nos. 2 through 11 and the related amendments were also roll-call votes. Reconsideration of Nos. 12 through 16 does not require a roll-call vote. The window of reconsideration for Proposals 2 through 16 is now open.

ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY — REQUIREMENTS

John Harper (Bridgewater State College): Having voted on the prevailing side, I would request reconsideration of Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Pam Roecker (Emmanuel College): As a former basketball coach, I would like the group to consider a couple of additional thoughts on the regulation of male practice players.

In my 15 years, I did not use male practice players, but I also appreciated that that was an option if my squad was depleted for any reason.

One of the points I would like to bring up in some research is these young men who serve as male practice players often develop a new-found respect for women's athletics.

They become great ambassadors of the programs that they are working with. Further, they become lifelong fans and supporters. As they develop into men with families, they bring their children. So it is a very positive relationship.

Secondly, I would like you to consider something unique in terms of a full squad that is able to practice and that it could arguably put the role players and the substitute players in a better position because they won't be on the scout team all the time, they won't be simulating the other teams' offenses, and they can actually run their own games.

As anybody who coaches knows, when you are watching that kind of practice simulation you are focusing on the "starting" group.

Thirdly, I have a great deal of confidence that all of my fellow ADs can monitor any potential use, misuse or overuse of male practice players on our own campuses, especially if we have potential gender-equity participation issues.

Finally, as a former athlete who came up in the silver edition that we honored as a 1983 graduate, we spent a lot of time fighting for the opportunity to play and participate. I would like the group to think of this as striving for the opportunity to continue to improve.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): When we made this choice we didn't consider all of the teams that don't have enough student-athletes to have full teams, so the males were part of that group that would allow them a full student-athlete experience.

For as many opportunities as we seem to think that are out there that are being violated and that individuals are overdoing their bounds with male practice players, I truly think we didn't look at the opposite side of how many teams are we now affecting where they can't have a full practice?

As I sit in my gym year after year watching women's teams come in and out, I see far more teams that don't have enough players on the teams to equate to a 12 or 15 total squad than I ever see 15 with potential of male practice players problems.

I think we have made a decision where we have made it worse for our student-athletes than actually better.

We have athletics administrators who have the ability to stop it.

If we have enough players on our teams, do your job.

Philosophically, make a statement to your coaches that we will not use them. But if we are not allowing teams to have their full experience, then we are in fact impacting the student-athletes' experience.

Pamela Wojnar (College of Notre Dame, Maryland): Am I correct in understanding that instead of stating our opinion on the legislation, we are supposed to be stating whether we feel it should be reconsidered?

Ms. Cushman: That is correct.

Ms. Wojnar: Then I would like to call for the question on that motion.

Georgana Taggart (College of Mount St. Joseph): You can give your opinion on the legislation itself because that would be part of your reason to persuade someone whether to vote for or against reconsideration. So you can give your opinion at this time.

The reason we'd rule a speaker out of order is if they'd actually talk about the main motion and urge you to vote in favor of the main motion.

Peggy Williams (Ithaca College): This organization exists to provide outstanding athletics opportunities for our student-athletes.

We exist for them, not the other way around.

If any of you had been at the breakfast with them yesterday, I wish you all had been, male and female members of SAAC were urging us to adopt this resolution in order to provide outstanding opportunities for women athletes.

I just wish all of them would stand up and speak as they did yesterday.

They are I would say adamant about this. I think we should respect their opinions since they are the athletes and the players.

Ms. Wojnar: I would still like to call the question on the window of reconsideration motion.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cushman: That is a nondebatable motion. This is to cease debate and reconsidering Proposal No. 8.

Just as a reminder, if it is not fully described on the screen, this is to cease debate on reconsideration of Proposal No. 8.

[The motion to call the question was approved, 349-77-3.]

We are now voting on whether or not to reconsider Proposal No. 8.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 8 was defeated, 203-229-3.]

Are there any other items for reconsideration?

Just as a reminder, the adoption of No. 8 will stand.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS — ACADEMIC AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES — SIMILAR SERVICES

Bill Moore (Little East Conference): Having voted on the prevailing side in the tie negative vote, I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jennifer Simon (Lewis & Clark College): I have two issues with 16.3 as it currently stands.

The clarity about which program activities and services are permissible and which are not make it virtually impossible for us to enforce.

The second issue I have is the thousands of NCAA Division III dollars that are being awarded to institutions to provide academic support and leadership training to student-athletes through internships, matching grants and other initiative grants.

I went to the Division III women and ethnic minority intern Web site just now and the first suggestion for how to use these internships is academic support services. Later on there was a suggestion for general support services.

If Division III funds are being awarded for these activities that seemed to be impermissible, then in my opinion there is clearly a need to clarify the language in this bylaw by adopting Proposal No. 5.

I urge you to reconsider our earlier vote on this issue.

Andrew Klein (Anna Maria College): I am dean of student affairs and retention at Anna Maria College.

As administrator with oversight for athletics and retention, it is the obligation placed on me to provide a balanced level of support for all of our students. That includes quality sports and services.

We need to reconsider this motion because it is also important in any retention plan to include programming for unique populations that include resident students, computers, Greeks, non-traditional students, academically unprepared students and athletes.

I don't want to see this tool removed from the retention toolbox.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 5 was approved, 273-153-2.]

Ms. Cushman: We now have an opportunity to reconsider Proposal No. 5. Is there anyone who would like to speak?

Fred Ohles (Nebraska Wesleyan University): In my view, those favoring this measure are fundamentally at odds with the spirit of Division III, and a favorable vote on this issue will drive deeper the wedge that is leading to a division of Division III.

I urge you to vote "no" again.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a conference that is in all the membership groupings with concepts that were discussed the other day falls into what would be Division IV, I would suggest to you that may not be totally accurate.

I don't know if I can add a great deal to what I stated earlier, but let me just give you one more example of a programming item that you would have to make available to all of your students if you were to do it for your student-athletes.

If you have a motivational speaker — you can take this to the ludicrous level — this would suggest if you have someone come in to give a pep talk to your football team from the outside, that that would be a violation of the letter at least of the rule.

So, once again, I think it just points out to the levels that this can go to given what the current legislation stated.

Ms. Cushman: I will turn to Mr. Jones to clarify the interpretation.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): To Gary's point, during the playing season, things such as motivational talks to the team could be construed as a practice activity for the team preparing for the contest.

I do not believe that would be in violation of the legislation.

Again, it would need to be during the playing season for the sport.

Paul Trible (Christopher Newport University): I rise in opposition to this amendment, as I did when it was first presented.

The central tenet of Division III is that student-athletes should be as fully integrated into the life of our schools as possible.

Admittedly, we have made some exceptions along the way, but this is another exception you are being asked to adopt today, which will take us a step away from that central proposition that unites us.

Arguments have been made today that the NCAA is spending millions of dollars to provide programming and that we cannot bring it back to our campuses, or that this amendment is necessary to do so.

That is absolutely false. Every lesson learned from the NCAA programs or from any other programs can be brought back to our campuses and be made available to our student-athletes.

But the requirement today is that those lessons, powerful and important as they are, should be limited not to just our student-athletes, but made available to all the students on our campus.

I think this is the right place for us to be, and I would urge the rejection of this amendment.

Brett Adams (Villa Julie College): In our view of student-athletes at our institution, which I know mirrors many other individuals, the student comes first before the athlete.

I need a question interpreted from your organization.

If we have coaches who conduct study halls for our student-athletes in the preseason or throughout the year, we are paying these coaches a salary and, therefore, that is an expense attributed toward that activity.

Is that now a part that is not acceptable?

Mr. Jones: Again, under the current Division III legislation, academic services that are offered must be offered to all students.

So the tutoring that is being offered must be open to all students to be offered.

Jack Ohle (Wartburg College): I stood to oppose this when we first considered it, and following the discussion I was even more convinced of my decision when I listened to the SAAC students say that they are students who are student-athletes.

We need to keep this in perspective. We are not trying to define all the loopholes, but I believe that it is important for us to make sure that when we provide different services on our campus for students, we do it for all students.

That's why we have elected to be Division III and uphold the philosophy of students first. I urge you to reject this.

Al Bean (University of Southern Maine): It is pretty common that everybody here would believe in integration and would like to have their athletes fully integrated and involved in a broad program.

I also think that our basic challenge is to have our students be as successful as possible. That includes involving them in many different activities.

There are certain programs that I think many people would agree are best offered through a learning community where those students are comfortable.

That doesn't mean that they shouldn't be involved in the rest of the campus.

But there are specific things that are best served in a comfortable environment with people who they trust and people who they know. That is only to better serve those students and help them be successful.

I don't think most people are looking to conduct a completely different program in athletics outside of the rest of the institution.

But there should be some accommodation for programming, frankly, that is going on already in a lot of places. It is probably going on pretty effectively.

Douglas Tima (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am Doug Tima a football student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee still urges you to oppose Proposal No. 5.

As was previously noted by many of our colleagues, student-athlete integration is paramount in Division III.

Granting speaker services exclusively to student-athletes will result in student-athletes becoming segregated from the general population.

Segregated is the key word. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee recognizes that student-athletes who are not just only students would benefit from this leadership education programming.

There are many individuals interested in athletically related programming on campuses beyond student-athletes, such as student trainers, student managers, management majors, and administration majors as well as many others who are involved with athletics.

William Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): Am I to understand the interpretation that now if an athletics coach offers a study hall to his team he must open that up to the entire campus?

Mr. Jones: In some of the questions, it sounds like the focus is on who is leading the study hall.

Certainly, a coach can work in academic services and offer study halls. But if study halls are available for student-athletes, they cannot be available exclusively for student-athletes. They have to have the same opportunities that every other student on campus has.

Mr. Klika: Let me continue that logical extension.

If the student-athlete comes to me for guidance or career planning, I must issue that same guidance to any student who approaches me? Am I correct?

Mr. Jones: I think if you are offering the service of career planning as a career planning resource on campus that would be correct.

I think if a student on their own came to you as a coach or athletics director and asked you to talk about life and some good advice, then it really doesn't get into the legislation.

As a staff, there are some concerns about how the present legislation is being used on your campuses. Within the membership, we discussed this issue before the Convention with the Management Council.

They have agreed that after the Convention they would be willing to look into that situation as far as possible forgiveness of past violations.

But I think that the discussion about the services being available to all students is one that is important.

Mr. Klika: If any of our student-athletes who has played for us came in for a recommendation, then we better not make that recommendation unless we are willing to do it for anyone on campus?

Mr. Jones: Again, I think if you are not advertising that as a service that you give, you are not really falling into the legislation at all.

I think if they come individually seeking advice, it is a different situation.

Pam Wojnar (College of Notre Dame, Maryland): The NCAA has so many programs to help us integrate the student part of our student-athletes.

CHAMPS/Life Skills talk about integrating the offices and working together. I don't see why we can't try to work together and we just offer these programs for all of our students and our student-athletes.

The SAAC has said it and many presidents and others have said that they are students first. The focus should be on the fact they are students first, because when they graduate from our institutions, if we have spent the time that they were in the institutions having them separated and having them with the people they feel most comfortable with, their teammates, when they get out into the "real" world, how will they succeed?

Are we truly preparing and educating our student-athletes to continue once they graduate from our institutions if we keep them separate?

I urge you to vote against this proposal.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I think to assume just because an activity is involved or directed to student-athletes separates them from the rest of the campus is not an accurate assumption.

For years now, we have been urging athletics teams to engage in community service activities, and those community service activities often involve just the members of a specific athletics team or athletes.

Yet those activities in many cases integrate the athletes with the rest of the campus for the larger community because they involve the student-athletes working as a group with other elements of the campus or the larger community.

A time management workshop directed at student-athletes who have time demands that are different and in many cases greater than many other students may actually facilitate the integration involvement of student-athletes in other campus activities because they manage their time better.

A diversity workshop presented by a consultant or facilitator provided by the NCAA directed to student-athletes may actually help student-athletes relate better to others outside of the athletics community and become more fully integrated into the life and involvement in their campus communities.

It's the same thing with leadership training directed at student-athletes just as training that is directed at Greek organizations prepare student-athletes to become involved in other organizations as leaders as well.

To assume that these activities only separate student-athletes from the rest of the community is not necessarily accurate.

Tori Haring-Smith (Washington and Jefferson College): I rise to urge you to oppose this.

I join my fellow presidents in saying that this is an issue that goes to the very heart of the essential nature of Division III.

I am convinced that those of you who have spoken in favor of this would not speak in favor of any kind of motion that would say that campus activities like time management seminars and leadership seminars should be offered for all students except athletes.

I think that the NCAA serves the higher-education purpose of this country by providing money that allows us to offer seminars on leadership, time management and diversity that serve not only the athletes but the rest of the college.

In that way, it fulfills its primary purpose, and we should further that. This is one way in which student-athletes become leaders on campus. They bring speakers of this sort to campus that serve all students.

I urge you to oppose this legislation.

Linda Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): I call for the question.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cushman: This is a nondebatable motion. This was a roll-call vote, so we will vote electronically. The motion is to cease debate on Proposal No. 5.

[The motion to call the question was approved, 403-22-4.]

With that, we will now move to voting on Proposal No. 5.

[Upon reconsideration, Proposal No. 5 was approved, 238-188-7.]

Are there any other items that the members of the body would like to bring forward for reconsideration?

With that, the window of reconsideration for Proposals Nos. 2 through 16 is now closed. That concludes our voting for today.

Thank you.

WORKING GROUP ON MEMBERSHIP ISSUES DISCUSSION

Mr. Fry: I would like to thank Val for doing an outstanding job in chairing this part of the meeting.

Next, we are going to go into a general discussion of the work of the Working Group on Membership Issues.

I will ask my colleagues on that group if they can join us up on the dais.

Rudy Keeling, the chair of the working group, will facilitate this portion of the meeting and field questions.

Before we begin this part of the program, I would like to recognize my colleague, Del Malloy, for a special presentation. Del.

Del Malloy (Salve Regina University): Thank you, President Fry.

I am a member of the Management Council. Before Val slips away, I would like to ask all the delegates to join me in showing our appreciation of Val for her purposeful and passionate leadership this past year on our behalf as chair of the Management Council.

[Note: The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Fry: Del, thank you.

I am going to relinquish the chair now to Rudy Keeling, commissioner of the ECAC, who is the chair of the Division III Working Group on Membership Issues.

Rudy Keeling (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Good afternoon and welcome. I am the chair of the Division III Working Group on Membership Issues and the commissioner of the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Joining me on the dais are the other members of the working group and staff.

I am going to ask them to introduce themselves and tell you what college or conference they represent: Chris Martin, commissioner of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin; Kay Whitley, director of athletics at Sul Ross State University, and a member of the American Southwest Conference; Kayla Hinkley, the University of New England and representative of the national SAAC; Kris Hall, director of athletics, Bard College; Stuart Gulley, president of LaGrange College, Great South Athletic Conference; Dan Fulks, Transylvania University, a member of the Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference; John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College; Eric Hartung, NCAA staff; Val Cushman, Washington and Lee University and a member of the Allegheny Mountain Athletic Conference; Richard Strockbine, director of athletics at the University of Dallas; Debby DeAngelis, California State University, East Bay; Jack Ohle, president of Wartburg College and a member of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Dick Rasmussen, executive secretary of the University Athletic Association; John Nazarian, president of Rhode Island College; Mark Majeski, athletics director at Willamette University and a member of the North Eastern Athletic Conference.

That is our group. We have been working for a little over a year on this issue. While I have the privilege of leading the discussion today, my colleagues and I are available to share with you other perspectives on any questions or comments you may have.

On behalf of the working group and the entire governance structure, thank you for your continued engagement on the important topic of membership structure.

You have been presented with a lot of information over the course of the last few days from the Association-wide forum on membership issues to the Division III Sunday issues forum to your conference meetings.

The December mailing and booklet handed out here in Nashville also are full of important information.

The goal of yesterday's forum discussion was to present an update on the progress of the membership working group to all Division III delegates and to begin this conversation at your round tables.

The 90 table facilitators recorded the sense of yesterday's conversation at each table, the results of which will be carefully reviewed by the working group.

We also asked each of your commissioners for feedback on conference-level membership discussions.

We hope to provide all members with an opportunity to share with the working group and with each other your thoughts, concerns and questions on the topic of our future.

Today's conversation is very important as it will help shape the course of the next round of research and information gathering.

It will impact future legislation and other recommendations made by the working group. In particular, feedback from today's session will prepare the working group to release its membership survey in the next three or four weeks.

The working group has prepared a series of questions to initiate discussion. This business session will begin with feedback from you on these questions.

I will begin the session with the first question, but I encourage you to ask questions of the working group staff and each other as we move along. If you have any concerns, ideas, questions or feedback not related to any of these questions, please share them when we move to an open-microphone format toward the end of the session.

We are going to go exclusively to the microphones and ask questions or make comments to get your overall feelings for where we are.

Finally, we are recording the discussion. Please state your name, position and institution when you approach the microphone.

The first question for consideration and to get us started: "What is the one new and significant piece of membership information learned at the Convention?"

With that, I will open it to questions and discussion. The microphones are open.

Linda Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): We know that the Executive Committee directed the working group to develop two models to address the various concerns that have been identified.

Was the working group, in fact, asked to address the status quo, and whether some of the membership concerns could be addressed within retainment of the status quo?

If they were told to do that, it would be helpful to know what, in fact, they looked at and what they may have rejected since that was not part of any of the models that we were presented.

A follow-up question would be if they were not asked to look at the status quo, why not?

Mr. Keeling: I can answer the second question first.

I don't know why not. The charge that we were given was to look at the best ways for us to take a group that has become oversized and either sub-divide or form a new division with that group. That is what we were asked to do. That is why the information that we have given you really addresses those points.

Mr. Fry: I can provide one little piece of content before that. Before this group was formed and the group that came from the Executive Committee, which Dan Curran chairs, it was a group chaired by Michael Adams, a member of the Executive Committee and a Division I president who is now chair of the Executive Committee. Mike chaired a group of about eight or so people, presidents from Divisions I, II and III.

They did about a three-month analysis, identified these as the two models they were most interested in, and then made a recommendation to the Executive Committee that these two models and any other ones that may emerge, would be studied thoroughly by these two committees.

That is how it went from a governance standpoint.

The initial work was done by a committee chaired by Mike Adams that had presidents from Divisions III, II and I represented. That was sort of the initial pass of this.

Then it filtered its way through to these two committees that we are talking about today. We were not directed to look at the status quo, we were directed to look at alternatives to the status quo.

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): Rudy, the fact that there will be absolutely no new money provided for a potential restructuring if we go to a Division IV means that essentially we would work with the 3.14 or 18 percent, whatever that percentage is, and that will have to make-do, whether there is one division or two divisions.

I would like to know if that is a rumor or a fact.

But that was information that came to me that I found quite stunning.

Mr. Fry: Rumor. And this ties into the issue regarding the broadcast renegotiation.

I think the reason that President Brand would like to work through this issue over the next several years is that in 2013 the broadcast agreement is to be renegotiated starting in 2010.

We had a series of one-year extensions that takes us out to 2013. This agreement could be potentially renegotiated before 2013, as early as 2010. I think the reason that he is anxious for us to work through this process during this year and over the next year as well is to try to understand whether there are going to be any fundamental changes in the divisional structure of the NCAA.

If that is the case, I think that will play a role in the way in which this is negotiated, although I am speculating on the issue of the various distribution among the divisions.

So the 3.18 percent is what we have right now.

Frankly, even though it sounds like a small percentage, it is quite a healthy number given the base from which we derive the 3.18 percent.

Right now, I think we have a fund balance of over \$11 million in the Division III account.

Some could argue that we now enjoy an over-funded position. I remember each and every year we add about an eight-percent inflation factor to that. That is the fact right now.

Could that change in the future? Yes, possibly.

I think that President Brand has been public about his desire to support this exercise financially without at this point revealing any details because he would have to see what we come up with. So that is definitely a rumor, not a fact.

But the fact is that we are leading up to the contract negotiations. Once you negotiate one of those contracts, as I understand, it is going to be sort of set for a long period of time, and the opportunity to renegotiate this 3.18 percent, if that were to be one of the things that we were to advocate, would essentially be lost if we go right up to 2013 and sign a new contract and keep the percentages in place.

I think he has used this as a window for money to be shifted or reallocated or added to the budget of this organization.

Ms. Ledwin: It is so important that we get this voted on by 2009.

Is it not equally important or shouldn't it be a concern that while we are being asked to move along a vote on restructuring, Division I at the same time has imposed a moratorium on their structure to study their system and their structure.

It seems a little strange that we are being forced to get our house in order, yet Division I doesn't. Aren't they the bigger key player in that CBS contract, and shouldn't we all have our structures in place and be concerned about it and not rush to that?

Mr. Fry: I can't explain to you the timing behind the Division I decision to go to a moratorium. It was sort of announced, and that was that.

I think some people in Division I would argue that they make the programs and services that we enjoy in Division III possible.

So that would be their position. I can't comment because I don't know what really drove the specific timing on the decision to have a Division I moratorium.

Ms. Ledwin: I have one last rhetorical comment, and I will sit down, I promise.

I just found it strange this is such a huge issue for the Association that there was little or I think no reference to it in Dr. Brand's address at the opening business session. I find that troubling.

Deborah McGrath (Colby-Sawyer College): I am the athletics director in the snowy state of New Hampshire. I want to thank the working committee.

This is a really difficult issue, and I truly believe you have mobilized us for change. However, we are also products of higher education, and unfortunately that means that we believe in the process of investigating ourselves as stakeholders.

In that process, I have several questions.

Number one, at this point in the process how is it that we are not able to consider more than one model other than the status quo? There have been other models that have been projected by the membership. That is question number one.

Secondly, is there still the opportunity or the possibility to consider other models at this juncture? A model that has been bandied about extensively here in Nashville falls between Division II and Division III, more restrictive in Division II and less restrictive in Division III, with zero financial aid projected on the basis of the athletics ability.

The ultimate model for new divisional or sub-divisional structure is too important for our student-athletes now and in the decades to come. It is too important for our institutions, not to mention our conference affiliations.

It is too important to rush to this decision for all of the above, not to mention the future division of whoever we are and whoever we may be.

Mr. Keeling: I will answer that very briefly.

We have two models that we are working with, a subdivision or forming a new division. Nothing is written in stone. The reason we are having this forum is because we want to have your input.

If you have something that is a feasible idea on how we can subdivide or how we can remain the same, we want to hear it.

I think that you will see some things come out in the survey that will offer you the opportunity to voice your opinion on those things.

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): Rudy, in regard to the survey, which is going to be released supposedly in February, I would presume that this document is already framed, is that correct?

Mr. Keeling: I am going to let Val answer that. She has been working on the survey.

Val Cushman (Washington and Lee University): I think the document is in the early stages of drafting. We are waiting for deliberations from our discussions this weekend to formulate the final draft of the survey.

Mr. Ladd: If the survey is framed in a way that directs Division III to split, then it would appear to me that it really isn't a survey, it is a directive order.

To this point, this is the first opportunity we have had microphones to address publicly in this Convention for the whole body. This issue is so important that we need to make sure that all the appropriate information is before all of us so that we can make an informed decision.

It is troubling to me that I came to the Convention and colleagues came up to me and said, "Oh, I am surprised. I saw your letter from the presidents to the CCIW.

"I appreciate that, because up until that time I thought you were in favor of Division IV."

The preliminary information that has been put forth by the Membership Committee inadvertently or advertently has set the framework to position different institutions and different conferences in a way that we may not be intending to go.

Mr. Keeling: I am going to let Val comment on your question about the survey.

Ms. Cushman: I appreciate your comments about how the survey will be framed based on the original charge to the committee.

I think the committee has moved beyond the original charge and is considering a wide range of opportunities and options.

With that, the document will be framed in such a way to provide input from a wide range of perspectives and will be intentionally designed to do so.

The research staff has provided us with immense amounts of information.

You may have found it easy to read those 150 slides in your packet, but creating them takes a tremendous amount of work. I will give credit to the research staff, which I believe will strive to provide a survey to our membership that will poll the interest of this membership.

The only other comment that I will add is that we will also in addition to today's discussion use the comments, pages and pages of comments from yesterday's round-table discussions, the discussion today as well as any comments that come to the committee before we put the final stamp on the surveys that we will send out.

Bill Gehling (Tufts University): I want to thank the leadership for giving us this opportunity and for re-ordering today's events to give us this opportunity.

Had you not, we would have had no chance to listen to each other in a public setting, because many of us

would have been heading to the airport. So I appreciate that response to the membership in the last two days.

As a member of the New England Small College Athletic Conference, a lot of people in this room assume that we are in favor of either a Division IV or a subdivision of Division III.

I have heard several people say that they think that we are somehow behind it or certainly in support of it. Nothing could be farther from the truth. This echoes the comment that was made by the previous speaker.

I personally have serious concerns about the possible negative consequences intended or unintended for either of these proposals.

This leads me to look more closely at the articulated justifications for moving this way.

The two justifications that I have heard are the growth that we have experienced in the past that we are likely to continue to experience. I would call that a primary concern.

The second concern would have to do with differing philosophical stances within this membership. The impact of the increased growth, as far as I can tell, would be twofold.

One, it could impact our access to championships so that if we look at the charts, and I agree, the staff did a tremendous job developing materials that we can take and look at, but if we look at those charts, the impact on championships will be to move from 1 to 6.5 ratio to maybe 1 to 6.7 or 1 to 7.

If it moved from 1 to 8, I don't think that would be the end of the world and certainly is not compelling enough to justify changes that could significantly impact people in this room.

The second reason has to do with the philosophical split people talk about. Personally, I don't think this split is as deep as it may appear by those slides. Even if it was, I think that that diversity of opinion in this room is part of what makes us strong.

We talk about diversity within our educational institution as strengthening the educational environment. We learn from people who see things differently than we do. We learn from people who face different challenges than we do.

I know when I try to decide how I am going to vote on many of these matters, often it is people from schools that are as different from Tufts as you can imagine who had the biggest impact on my vote because I realized that will not really affect me that much. But for them, it will help them survive.

I celebrate that diversity among us. In fact, if you look at competitive equity within our division, the reality is those of us who either have more restrictive rules or have more restrictive rules by our own choice, as other conferences have, do pretty well competitively.

I don't have a real problem with a subset either favoring or trying to advocate more permissive rules if it helps them survive.

What I am trying to say is that I think legislation as significant, as momentous as restructuring really requires a full and open and lengthy discussion before we move forward, because otherwise you risk people voting down change not because they really dislike the change, but because they dislike the process.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I would like to try to address an answer to the question that you asked to begin this session.

Rudy, what have I learned in these last couple of days?

I have learned that Division III does not have a right to be an exclusive club. I learned at the same time that Division I can put a moratorium on their membership to decide who they are, so they can decide who they are going to let in.

I have also learned that we are part of an Association whose actions are going to affect the other divisions. That is something I have learned. I have learned also that we are very diverse and that our numbers have outgrown the Association's ability to meet our needs.

I have also learned that there is a clear difference in program approach between different institutions. I guess I knew that. I also learned that we have a fiduciary obligation to examine these issues with a long-term perspective. We don't want to leave our mess for the future.

Given the circumstances of today and the impending contract negotiations, this is the best time to go through these issues.

I also found out that if we divide into divisions, and decide to have a Division III-A as an example, it is real-

ly no longer an Association issue. We can vote on that.

I also learned that if we decide we want to go to a Division IV, then it is an Association issue and that it would be voted on with that intent. The advantage of having this be an Association issue is that we then would have to come up in the contract negotiations as legitimate groups to get new funding.

As Division III and III-A, maybe we wouldn't because the Association didn't get to vote on it.

I am concerned with the process, as many people have mentioned. The initial lead-in to this process was if we were to subdivide, how would we do it as opposed to asking the question should we subdivide?

I am concerned because essentially we will become an exclusive club, an elitist group who determines membership based on sports sponsorship. I am also concerned that looking at the statistics that you gave us yesterday, that the most recent members since 1990 have had smaller sports sponsorships and have had a desire for less restrictive activities or rulings and legislation than the former Division III members had, and yet seemingly when I look at the splitting apart of the division those people who reflected what Division III was are being moved into Division IV.

I guess that is a little bit of a concern. You get kicked out of your house because you reflect on what the division was.

My concern in this process is that if we split, the initial phase will all be running under the same legislative structure that we currently have as far as the rules are concerned.

I suppose that there is a chance in the voting process that we could choose to be restrictive and to be the same, so there really wouldn't be any difference between Division III and Division IV other than the name.

But then in the process yesterday, I learned that it could have reduced seasons. It could have strict academic performance tracking. It could have greater presidential oversight.

I thought that is what we were supposed to have. It could have restricted recruiting.

These were suggestions that that new division could look like this. I would contend that it could not. It could look identical to what it already is.

I also learned that there are 150 to 200 presidents who are in favor of going to the new division.

I have talked to many of my colleagues from across the country, and nobody seems to know who those presidents are.

I have the greatest respect for each and every one of the members of the working group.

I am humbled to stand before you, but I am also concerned that when you look at this process we are going to have to hire additional staffing in regard to this because we are going to grow.

There are 3,000 academic institutions out there that don't belong to the NCAA.

If you think in your division that the small college non-scholarship division is going to take care of those 3,000 institutions, you are sorely mistaken.

I just want to make sure this is not a championships issue, because I remember when we federated and we had the new philosophy, there were a whole lot of things in that philosophy that we all held dear, but championships wasn't the primary focus. Yet, our first legislative moves under that federation were championships.

If we go from the current 422 active members to the 480 projected by the year 2020, our ratio will go from 6¹/₂ to 1 to 7.19 to 1.

I know that is a drastic increase. But all we want is a chance.

Mr. Keeling: I would ask in fairness to everybody if we could keep our comments to maybe five minutes. We have got a lot of people at the microphones and we can get everybody in.

Marybeth Lamb (Regis College, Massachusetts): I would like to thank and commend the Division III working group for its efforts in tackling a very difficult issue.

As the director of athletics of a college that is currently undergoing a coeducational transformation, I understand change is often necessary and at times painful.

However, I do have an area of concern. Based on the information presented, both in writing and in personal discussions, it would appear that the NCAA is sending a troubling message.

It appears that if the Association chooses to keep Division III as is with subdivisions, then funding from the national office and other funding sources remains as is.

Thus, as membership increases, effective funding per institution would decrease.

However, if, and only if, a new grouping is established, we have been assured that additional funding would be “found,” thus maintaining or potentially increasing per-institution funding.

It would seem that the message being sent by the working group is that if Division III does not support the creation of a new grouping, institutions can expect decreased per-institution funding.

I believe that the NCAA should be able to find appropriate funding for an increasing membership in whatever final form it takes.

I urge the working group to clarify funding methods before sending the survey out in February.

Mr. Keeling: I am going to let President Fry answer that, but before I do I hope you are hearing what we are saying.

I appreciate that everybody has their own opinions, but I don’t remember that being said at all.

President Fry will comment on it.

But I don’t remember there being a comment about there being funding one way or the other.

Mr. Fry: Let’s assume for a second that none of these discussions were going on about restructuring; that we were just in sort of a status quo state and we were heading toward 2010, beginning to anticipate a renegotiation of a contract.

I don’t know what the process is for setting percentage allocations, but I am pretty sure that no decision has been made on that, and no one would presume right away that that discussion couldn’t be had.

I don’t know what the dynamics are because I wasn’t here when they started doing this many years ago in terms of crafting these allocations.

But based on what I know from the Executive Committee, it hasn’t begun to entertain the specifics of a contract nor has it begun to talk about an allocation, which means that if we want to make a request for more we certainly could do that.

Whether it would be granted, I am not sure.

So I don’t think a decision has been made on the 3.18 percent allocation going forward.

It may be an assumption, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that it will be a reality, whether it is looking at the proposals that we are talking about or even just assuming status quo.

Jerry Boyes (Buffalo State College): I must admit that over the last few months I have been increasingly confused.

Yesterday took away a lot of the confusion, but increased my concern.

Over the last four or five years, there has been a great deal of discussion and changes based on philosophical beliefs of institutions under the guise of reform.

There have been issues regarding championships, nontraditional seasons, redshirts and length of season as examples.

It is evident that the growth of our division since 1990 has led to changes due to philosophical beliefs.

Up until the past few months, it has been my understanding that the charges of the working group were to ferret out those philosophical differences and put forth models for the membership to consider.

I see it in terms of one being restrictive and one less restrictive. Somehow enrollment in sports sponsorship has come into these models based on statistics.

I do caution us to simply look at statistics and make models and decisions.

Statistics are the primer for discussion that leads to decisions.

In 1975, when the NCAA voted to re-organize into three divisions, enrollment and sports sponsorship had nothing to do with those decisions made by colleges and universities.

They made decisions based on their philosophical beliefs of where they wanted their athletics program to be.

You say it will be a self-determination process.

I say that as soon as you add enrollment size and sports sponsorship into the equation, you take away self-determination.

If we are to roll out models, I believe they should reflect the discussion that has been taking place in the last four or five years for the membership to make their thoughts on those models and make decisions based on where

they feel their institutions should be philosophically.

I have listened to discussion ranging from sub-division to new division to staying the same.

There are a lot of people who are still wondering where to go.

It would be interesting if we, as a colleague suggested to me, would take our electronic devices and take a straw vote before we leave to see how the membership does feel — whether to split or stay the same.

I believe it would be interesting to see the results of that vote.

Bill Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): In response to your question, Rudy, when the charts were first sent out, the first thing that jumped out is if there is a subdivision or a split, it is three places not two because the voting pattern suggests two extremes and a very big middle.

The concern I would have if there is a split is that the group in the middle then moves to an end. And the term “less restrictive” was used.

The large group in the middle seems to be happy with the present status.

So if there was a split, was any thought ever given to making the split not in two but in three?

Mr. Keeling: If there is a split, the split would be as we have looked at it now before a more restrictive group and Division III as we see it now.

Gerald Maticotta (North East Collegiate Volleyball Association): I was going to say the same thing.

It also occurs to me as a working group there is money involved, there is time, there is effort by your people.

I have been at the Convention now for six days, and everybody I talked to from many colleges to the SAAC, has been opposed to what you have been doing.

I don't know that we need an electronic straw vote, but I would like to see a raising of hands.

I have not met one person who is in favor of the split.

If there is one person in this room besides the working group in favor of the split, please get up to the microphone and tell me why you are in favor of the split or let's have a vote.

Why continue to go on to next year if everyone is opposed to it?

That is my only question.

Mr. Keeling: Jerry, that is why we are going to have the survey, so we can see where people are. Within the survey there will be a chance for you to say where you would like to see our division go.

Those results will be distributed to everyone so that you can see just how your comrades voted.

Dale Knobel (Denison University): I want to remind the membership that the working group and the Division III leadership and the leadership of the Association have only been responsive to the membership in taking this issue forward.

When I became a Division III college president 10 years ago, my predecessor briefed me that questions about the future of Division III and the prospects of growth were already objects of discussion at these meetings and among college presidents.

Throughout my 10 years, this has been a constant object of conversation at these meetings, at conference meetings and a variety of higher-education associations meetings across the country.

This body has previously approved over the last 12 to 15 years moratoriums on at least two occasions.

We have discussed where we should alter the minimum sports sponsorship requirement on repeated occasions.

Presidents across the country have been talking officially or unofficially about this issue for at least the last half dozen years.

The Annapolis Group of colleges, with approximately 150 institutions, made it an object of discussion at its meeting this last year.

In lobbies of the ACE, the AACNU and the CIC, this is a regular object of discussion among Division III presidents.

In many of the regional collaborative organizations — the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the Associated Colleges of the South, the Great Lake Colleges Association and others — it is also discussed.

I want to remind everyone that this came to the working group because individual colleges, presidents, conferences and associations asked the Association to be responsive to us and examine different possibilities.

The status quo is always on the table. But unless we are confronted with the widest variety of possibilities that causes us to stretch, we are not going to have that full and complete discussion that is required of us.

I compliment the working group on laying before us proposals that may lie at the stream, but will get us to think.

Perhaps the answer lies somewhere in between, but I think that without the challenge and the data shared by the working group, we wouldn't be in a position to carry on a conversation that is really more than 10 years old.

I know that presidents come and go, athletics directors come and go and that FARs come and go, but this is a very old conversation and not new over the last six days.

I hope we are in the middle of that conversation and that we carry it forward with great energy in the year to come.

Matt Newman (Northwest Conference): I speak on behalf of our presidents, athletics directors and FARs in saying thanks to the extensive efforts of the working group and thanks to the Executive Committee for bringing this issue forward before it could become a potential problem in 2020 or whenever that might be. Thanks for that.

With that said and with all due respect, the Northwest Conference stands in opposition to the creation of a new division.

We have put out a position paper on this, and I won't go into great detail. It does echo some of the comments we have heard thus far.

I would bring out though the idea of geographical isolation and what that does to the idea of subdividing or a new division.

It worries us a great deal, and it could worry a number of other conferences that have geography concerns.

I too ask the question of who is in support of this?

We would very much favor a straw vote at this time.

We would also ask for the working group to address how a new division could enhance the student-athlete experience.

We are not certain that it makes a case, and we also are concerned about the issue of enrollment at our colleges.

At Saturday's session, the president of Adrian College made a very good point about how many of us are enrollment driven, and this would be of great concern to a number of institutions.

I encourage a straw vote to know who is in support of this.

The Northwest Conference urges you to please not rush to judgment in the creation of a new division.

Douglas Bennett (Earlham College): One of the things I have learned from this Convention is that there is a tremendous amount of anxiety and anger in this room.

I think we all ought to just take a moment to think about what that anger and anxiety means.

It certainly means change is hard.

As the previous speaker said, these are not new issues.

I am surprised, perhaps I shouldn't be, that others are surprised that we are talking about change, because these issues have been before us for a decade and more.

We have largely considered them through votes on very specific legislative matters. Those votes have often been closely contested votes.

I am one president for change. I have been persuaded we needed change for at least five years, and it has been frustrating not to be able to address those issues of change.

Why do I think we need change? We need change because there is a philosophical difference within Division III that is deep and growing.

I don't think that if you are a newcomer to this you need any more evidence than the votes on Proposals 5, 6, 7 and 8 today, especially the vote on No. 5 and the reconsideration and the passage of that despite a number of people saying this goes right to the heart of Division III philosophy.

There are people who are on both sides of this issue. I recognize that. But that is precisely the point.

There are at least two very different ways of thinking about these issues that we are trying to contain in Division III.

It has been 35 years since the NCAA considered its divisional structure.

Virtually everything about American higher education has changed in those 35 years. It is time for us to give fresh consideration to how the divisional structure of the entire NCAA ought to be structured and not cling to what we have simply because we have had it for a very long while.

We normally consider change at this Convention by voting on legislative proposals.

What we are trying to do is very hard, and in that spirit I want to thank, as others have, the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the membership working group because they are trying to engage a very, very large organization — an organization that I believe has grown much too large — in a conversation.

They have been wide open to hearing from us for a very long while. This is our first chance to have a public discussion of it, but I think they are doing a terrific job and are doing a wonderful job for getting us ready with a lot of data.

Are we ready for it to be done? No, but we do need to listen to one another, even though that is going to be difficult because we have gotten so large and because we are angry and anxious.

Let's take our time. Let's do this survey. Let's listen carefully to it. Let's trust our elected leaders.

Lynn Tipson (Washington College, Maryland): For this academic year, I am the president of the Centennial Conference. I speak for myself and for my fellow presidents.

I would like to say to the working group that not only do I thank you, but I support you. You have not had a lot of that today.

Our playing and practice seasons in the Centennial Conference are somewhat shorter than is allowed by NCAA Division III guidelines. We like that. We like where we are. We do not want to become more restrictive.

I have been attending NCAA Conventions off and on as a college president since 1995, and it has been plain to me, as it has to some of my colleagues since the very beginning, that there is a split in the membership.

A significant number of Division III members would prefer to expand playing and practice seasons, would prefer to consider redshirting and would generally prefer to loosen up some of the reform legislation that was passed in 2004 — reform legislation that those of us who supported it felt was intended not to make Division III more restrictive but to maintain the philosophy that led to the original formation of Division III back in the early 1970s.

I think that is an important distinction.

We don't want to be more restrictive, we want to hang on to the Division III that we have known.

Our primary goal has been to preserve what we believe to be an appropriate balance between intercollegiate athletics competition and our academic programs.

We have become convinced that the inevitable growth in membership in Division III is going to make it more and more difficult to preserve Division III as we know it.

We believe that the proposals of the working group provide the best opportunity we have yet seen to preserve the balance between intercollegiate athletics competition and academic excellence to which we are committed.

We encourage the working group to continue its work and to take into consideration the concerns that have been raised at this Convention.

Donald Brooks (Williams College): My athletics director wanted me to make sure that I let you guys know these are my thoughts, so I will still have an intern check when I get back to school.

As I sat in a room with other DIII administrative interns debating membership issues, a common theme arose in the conversation that has not been addressed in the slide show and the presentations.

Will the proposed division enhance the experience of our student-athletes?

I am an assistant coach for a football team that some may consider Division IV.

We play eight league games and don't have playoffs. Other sports play a wide range of teams in New England and across the country. Many of these schools are less restrictive, have more practice and playing opportunities, and have a nontraditional season.

Our kids like these games. Our kids want a great competitive experience that they can learn from.

As an athletics director in our league said earlier, we enjoy the opportunity to play schools that are different. There is a significant educational opportunity in playing schools with a difference in athletics philosophy, school size and by their voting record.

We value that diversity.

The research provided leaves me with questions and concerns. One question that I have is what would the recommendation be of that 44-percent majority that votes alike, and what would be the recommendation of our student-athletes?

My concerns include the impact on travel, missed class time and the impact on regional sports like lacrosse and field hockey and the negative connotations of a Division IV and the potential for branding.

As a former Division III athlete and a current intern administrator working with other intern administrators and future Division III leadership, I ask if there is any change, let's make sure there is change in the best interest of our student-athletes.

I ask that administrators, presidents and ADs talk to their student-athletes when you get back to your campus, and open the envelope and look at the survey.

When in doubt, ask your intern.

Thomas Hart (Webster University): As we have learned in the last few days, growth and philosophy are two of the driving principles of the working group and the work they are doing.

I appreciate the work that they are doing.

For a moment, though, I would like to examine growth, because everybody is talking about growth, growth, growth — whether it is in the debates or whether it is in our group in Division III.

It seems as though we have already done a reasonable job of planning for growth by saying we will accept no more than four schools a year.

If you look at where we will be in 10 years according to the charts, graphs and tables we have been presented, we are going to add about 40 schools to the situation, yet we are continually told that growth is an issue and that we are not going to provide services to our membership.

We have more than 440 members. We are looking at potentially adding 10 percent in 10 years, yet for some reason it is a driving principle that is making us think that something is broke.

At the same time, we are told that we have a budget surplus of almost \$12 million.

Clearly, we are being very responsible in our actions, especially as a not-for-profit, that we have that much money in our bank account.

I am not angry and I am not anxious, but one of the things I would like clarified as we move forward from the group to the survey and whatnot is how the effect of growth is all of a sudden rampant and out of control, especially given the fact that it appears that we have the financial resources — not even including what is going to happen in the new contract — to be able to take care of a reasonable portion of this growth.

As we move forward, you are going to need to convince me that growth is rampant and out-stretching our resources.

Mr. Keeling: I do think if you look at the slides and look at the data that have been passed out, you will be able to see how we have grown and what the potential is for growth and then make your own conclusions.

Al Ackerman (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): Is the status quo going to be a choice on the survey?

Mr. Keeling: There will be a position that you can take that would leave you at the status quo.

Zak Ivkovic (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I also want to thank the working group for your due diligence in trying to solve some of the problems of the membership, but I also fear that your charge from the beginning was a misguided one.

The Executive Committee directive to you was to look at two options, and I am afraid that they really don't have the feel for the pulse of Division III if they only think there are two options out there.

If you look at the straw polls taken at the commissioners' meeting, that probably is the only place that will give you a straw vote today. The results show that roughly two-thirds of the membership like Division III as is. Judging by some of the comments from those who we felt were on the other side, perhaps that has grown to much more than two-thirds.

Some of you say that we are oversized. What does that mean?

It means that we are the largest division for a reason.

Maybe we are the best division, maybe they want to join us. Maybe we should celebrate our growth instead of fighting it.

Yes, it would absolutely be irresponsible for us not to look at the future and consider growth.

But it would also be irresponsible if the leadership would not look at today's reality in this room and realize that the tide is on the other side.

Perhaps the working group should look at other options, including in your survey.

It is also a shame to me that it took four days for us to bring this topic up and discuss it here. This is our future, and with a third of the membership at the airport, the straw poll will mean a lot less even if we have one.

My hope for all of us is that going forward we can spend as much time, effort and money on strengthening and improving the current Division III as we have tried in dividing it.

Debra Townsley (Nichols College): This is a critical philosophical issue for institutions.

It is an issue of branding. It is how we see ourselves. It is how we recruit and retain students and staff.

I think this goes to the heart of all of us, that it goes to the very value-centered philosophy we share and that change is very difficult.

I also think that as we discuss this in that light, there needs to be more information provided on branding of DIII versus DIV, branding within subdivisions if we do that and branding if we stay the same and the conference championships change.

How do we finance this? If we are to vote, what are we voting on? We are not quite sure what each of those new divisions represent.

Those are issues I think we need to discuss and develop over the next year.

Another issue is that the demographic shifts in the next decade are quite severe, especially for those in the Northeast and other parts of the country.

I think there should probably be some consideration of that in the discussion.

I agree that the information presented by the working group is a great starting point for discussion.

After working with Eric Hartung on the Financial Aid Committee, I believe he is really good at these research pieces. However, I think that we need more information as we go through the year.

This looks as though it will be called for a vote by the Executive Committee in 2009.

How will this kind of forum, where we can have an open discussion about multiple options, occur so that presidents and their staffs in this next year can come prepared to make a decision understanding multiple options that have been reviewed, discussed and presented? Will we then vote? I don't understand how that is going to happen between now and 2009.

Mr. Keeling: I want to respond to that last piece about the forums.

As you know, we met with the presidents yesterday at lunch with Dr. Brand. I talked to a number of attendees afterwards who requested that we figure out a way to have a series of regional meetings with presidents and provide some other opportunities for us to have discussions that I thought were very productive like we had yesterday over lunch.

We are going to work on attempting to stage a series of these so we can make it as accessible as possible and give people multiple opportunities if there is a scheduling conflict.

I certainly sense something like that will happen over the next year.

Ms. Townsley: I would like to say that all of us in DIII for the most part are changed institutions because a lot of us are small and tuition-driven. If you don't change, you go out of business. So we do understand and agree with change.

I think when it is change of this magnitude, there needs to be time for discussion. I am not sure if we can accomplish it by 2009.

If we can't, do we get an extra year? I don't want to have the vote called before the presidents really do engage in this topic.

Mr. Keeling: I think that 2009 is not hard and fast. I think we have set that as a goal, but ultimately if we feel that we are not ready to vote on it and don't feel that you have enough information, we wouldn't go forward in 2009.

Ms. Townsley: I also suggest if there is an idea of a subgroup or two divisions, that whoever would be in each of those divisions have preliminary discussions about what they would look like so we know what we are picking.

Mr. Keeling: I agree.

Richard Cook (Allegheny College): I want to thank the working group. I know you have taken shots today. Questions about the process are legitimate, but if the tone reaches one of questioning their integrity or motivation, I think that is improper.

I hope we will all sit back and think about the hard work and many hours and days and weeks that we have put in working on this in response to many of the issues raised by the membership.

Thank you for your efforts and thank you for your willingness to listen to questions of process, which I think you are absorbing and indeed should. Those are legitimate.

I also compliment you on the past months of communication. I felt like I was fully informed through the process from the many mailings and publications.

To act as if we are hearing this for the first time is a bit extreme. This may be the first time we have had a chance to talk, but the encouraging part is that we are given a chance to talk, that there is a survey coming and that we are being listened to from yesterday's round-table discussions.

People need to understand that this is a difficult process. It will be a long process. There is a lot of discussion to take place.

As I have listened to presidents and others over the last couple of days, there is a great deal of affection for Division III and Division III philosophy, which I respect very much.

Division III is changing from under us. I think demographics show it, the votes show it and the study shows it.

I would like to try to reframe the issue into a win-win situation. As we go forward, are there things that can serve the wider membership to a greater advantage without focusing on a split and a division of opinion?

Are there opportunities for members of the division to use broad-based programs with large numbers of sports sponsorship and high levels of participation of their students and others who are more focused on a smaller number of sports?

If I was a president of an institution and had the smaller number of sports and I was facing an increasing requirement of minimum numbers of sports, I would be very concerned about that. It might not meet my circumstances and my budget.

It seems to me this could be a win-win situation if we consider it carefully and if we deliberate and trust each other through this process.

Membership growth has been projected on a very conservative basis — four per year. But we have heard again and again that the moratoriums or restrictions or caps are temporary measures.

I am not sure any of us feel very good about that. There is no guarantee that there wouldn't be a large number of new members lining up to get in and could be if those caps are lifted or must be lifted.

I know there are dozens of colleges and universities out there that if given the opportunity would consider coming in, which would lead to a different face of the organization and a demographic shift.

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Not to be redundant, but I think it is important to again acknowledge the efforts of the working group and the staff to make the change in the format for today's discussion.

I know that it was not easy to be able to switch from dividing up into separate rooms and coming together to arrange the timetable. Thanks for that good-faith effort.

I will try to be brief. However, in order to direct my comments more toward what I think is the most important part of the discussion is to give guidance about the survey.

I would like to be specific. I enjoyed immensely the round-table discussions because I was at a table with very different institutions than the ones I represent.

In asking a number of them what were the most important things that they felt about the two models, or what they objected to or supported, I got very different responses.

In asking them what their greatest concerns were, I got really different responses. I think that the time will pass quickly and the survey will be important in guiding the framework for the models that will exist. It is time to start to think specifically what the issues will be that will cause us to support one model versus the other or not at all.

Things like the number of sports we sponsor are important to our conference. Sports like field hockey, men and women's lacrosse, men and women's hockey, and women's crew all need support in order to provide a meaningful experience to our student-athletes.

Asking those kinds of specific questions on the survey is essential to have us come in with an open mind about supporting one model versus the other.

The second thing is that there also can be questions that may get people's perceptions about how these models might be developed. The perceptions might be as important as the realities as we go forward.

Dealing with perceptions, I also found that these Conventions can be the deciding factor. I urge you to listen carefully, use the round-table discussions and start to get specific.

From some of your questions I know that is hard at this point, but many of those specific issues will really be the deciding factor for various conferences.

Todd Hutton (Utica College): I would like to also thank, and I am sure you are getting tired of the laudatory comments, the membership working group. You were given an unenviable charge. I think it was a misguided charge, not to have a more open agenda and a more open charge. But I applaud you for helping guide us in what really is a mission review process.

I would like to frame this discussion as a mission review of Division III. That's what we are talking about today. That's what good organizations do in best practices.

This should happen about every 10 years. I would like to ask the leadership to be sure that we do this about every 10 years so we can step back and ask the very important questions that are necessary for a good, healthy organization.

Again, I thank you for initiating a mission review process.

It goes beyond size. It goes well beyond size. Size is the pretext for other questions. Size questions are easy to address. If you look at the various models to address size, and if we celebrate diversity and we celebrate size, I think the answers are much easier.

But when we start talking about mission, it is a much more difficult question.

Utica College has voted for every restriction. We probably look like one of those institutions that are favoring a more restrictive approach to a Division III or some would say a Division IV.

However, the Empire 8 and Utica College at this point in time have voted in our conference to oppose a subdivision or creation of a division, not because as our chair said if we take a pass on this because it is too disruptive or uncomfortable then shame on us.

We don't need to be shamed. We need to take time for the kind of deliberation that we need to look at many of the questions that people have raised today.

For example, there is concern about schools coming in that are smaller with fewer programs. We have not asked the question what the ratio is of student-athletes to the student body in those programs. It may not be different than a school with 3,500 students, with 18 programs or 20 programs, for example.

I don't think that we should assume that a smaller number of programs and a smaller institution has a less broad-based approach to athletics.

As for the issue of restrictions, we know there are conferences that have more restrictive policies of their own. Those conferences have very successful athletics programs.

As the Presidents' Athletic Conference standings show, we wish they weren't so successful, frankly.

However, there are issues before us such as Proposal 5 today that I fear may be a prompter of some of the divisions in philosophy. We need to look very, very carefully at the nuances of those.

Finally, in light of the reform that has occurred over the last few years, I think we should give credit to ourselves. We stepped back and we have put in place some more restrictions and more balance.

As my athletics director always says, "Let's be sure to have balance all the time." It is always a matter of negotiating balance.

As we celebrate some of our successes with reform, as we begin looking at emerging questions about criteria related to restrictiveness, size and broad-based participation, we need to make sure, and this is one of the fears that I have heard quite a few other presidents express, that there are not unintended consequences if we were to

move forward with a subdivision or new division.

One of those unintended consequences could be creating a division within the NCAA that could be based on wealth, prestige and privilege of institutions.

I urge the Executive Committee since it seems to be driving this and I urge the Presidents Council to re-examine the premise behind the proposal to subdivide or create a new division and ensure that the NCAA is not moving toward creating divisions based upon wealth, prestige and privilege, which would not be amenable to the values of this great organization.

Pamela Wojnar (College of Notre Dame, Maryland): Although I agree with the statements that these are not new issues, I also agree with the statement that NCAA President Myles Brand was quoted as saying in today's issue of The NCAA News that was delivered to your doors. I quote, "Many institutions are just now beginning to understand what the issues are. The Association-wide conversations about membership growth are in effect taking place for the first time."

So while the issue is not new, the conversations are. Additionally, Charles Ambrose, the Division II Presidents Council chair, is quoted in the same article as saying, "Because of the strategic planning process we have been through, Division II is ready to enable at least some dialogue among both Division I and Division III members. That's where Division II brings value."

With that said, I have two questions for the working group.

One, will such dialogue occur?

Mr. Keeling: Yes, it will.

Ms. Wojnar: When? Will it be before the survey? Will it be included with the survey?

Mr. Keeling: I think it is going to be included with the survey. It will be.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): I think the reminder is that the Executive Committee's working group does include representation from Divisions I, II and III.

The Division III working group reports are shared with the Executive Committee's working group, so division representatives have been actively involved in the process.

Ms. Wojnar: I understand that. This article is saying that they are open to dialogue now. It implies that is something new.

Mr. Dutcher: I would not agree with the concept that we have not had dialogue with Division III leadership regarding this concept.

Ms. Wojnar: Since it has been asked by at least three members before me, is this the forum for a straw vote? If it is, what do we need to do to take one?

Mr. Keeling: This forum gives us a feel for what we need to put into the survey. We think we can get the same results from that.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): Let me express my opinion on the straw poll. I think it would be inappropriate to vote since there is no way to know what we are voting on.

We are going to take another year to decide what it is we would be voting on. That is going to be based on input we get from various sources.

I know this is the third time you have asked for a straw vote, but I don't think it is possible to vote without knowing what the alternatives really are.

The survey is going to serve as a straw poll. The survey will not be dichotomous. The survey will ask more than would you like a 19- or 21-week playing and practice season.

This survey may well give us ranges from a dozen to 30. The survey itself is going to serve as a straw vote. I don't see what we would vote on today.

While I am here, the issue of branding has come up more than once as has funding.

President Brand has spent quite a bit of time with the working group, and he has been part of the discussions. The two things that I remember most about his input were that money cannot drive this decision. He was pretty clear in saying you guys determine what the best way to handle our growth is, and we will find the funding to support whatever the membership comes up with.

In addition, he said there will be a branding effort if the vote by the membership is to divide in some man-

ner, whether it is a new division, and please don't call it Division IV, or a subdivision. New branding initiatives would be necessary for both groupings.

If there is a split of Division III, then the existing Division III is going to have to do some branding as would the new grouping.

He is well aware of that. Everybody is well aware that there is going to be a major branding initiative to take place with both groupings.

Michael Sutton (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): This has been an especially good conversation for me to hear as I go back to my campus to deal with the institution and our conference and the rest of that.

I am always impressed by the good thinking and the articulation of the people who come to the microphone. I will try not to let you down on that.

The fact is most everyone has hit the high points I would want to say. But I do have my president's voice in my ear right now, and she had to leave us early this morning.

Keep your mind open and engage in the process and ask the questions. Let's get them going. The questions being asked are the ones I would be looking for. I support getting answers to those questions as we prepare to do this survey.

I am going to keep my mind open. I am going to argue as strongly as I can for the positions that I believe most strongly in. But I also know from the conversations that I hear and after going through some other discussions of previous years, that our open-mindedness will definitely improve the climate of our debate and it will be very helpful as we sort out the paths that we are going to go down as we solve the challenges facing Division III now.

Sharon Beverly (Vassar College): We have stated that the basis of the Division III philosophy is the student-athlete experience.

The Convention affords us the opportunity to discuss this type of issue on a broader level.

Similarly, it gives our student-athletes the same opportunity.

I am very interested in hearing what our student-athletes have to say on this issue.

Kayla Hinkley (University of New England): Representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee on this committee has allowed me to bridge the gap between the information that is being circulated.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is hearing the same new information as the membership has.

Luckily, we have had the chance of having been on this committee to try to explain this a little bit more now that I know what I am talking about.

The national SAAC has gotten together this weekend and discussed what kinds of issues that we feel are going to affect any type of change that may occur.

The SAAC currently is not taking any formal position on this issue.

We need to consider and discuss all of our options with the student-athletes we represent. Our charge after this Convention is to do that.

We are going to talk about how we can get the student-athlete voice represented on each campus.

We will also go back to our conference SAAC and our institutional SAACs and ask questions.

What are the things that mean the most to you? Do you know or are you well-versed in these issues?

We are going to raise more awareness on our campuses, because that is what we were elected in our positions to do.

Currently, some of the issues that we believe are important consist of the travel time and potential missed class time that we might encounter. We are very sympathetic to the students who unfortunately don't have the opportunity to be geographically located among other institutions that are 20 minutes away or an hour away.

We do feel empathetic for those institutions that have to travel a great distance and are considering that if there was any type of division.

We also are worried about the naming and the branding of the potential new divisions.

A lot of the same things that I am hearing about your concerns are also the concerns that we have.

One of the other things that I have not heard yet is the rivalry traditions that we hold so dear. Some of those

traditions and those rivalries attracted us to your institution when you were recruiting us. We are very concerned about the future of those, because we do believe they promote institutional pride and accomplishment in athletics.

We also do have some concern about championships in the sense that how will championships be determined and available in the future? That can relate to a lot of different areas, but it can relate to recruiting as well.

The idea of striving and reaching goals to be a conference or a national champion is something we hold dear. We're proud of our student-athletes and we tell them to set goals for themselves not only in academics and athletics, but we see that national championship as a real goal for all of our athletics teams. So we are concerned about that as well.

When you are engaging in these discussions, we encourage presidents and athletics administrators to listen to the voices of the student-athletes when completing the survey in February.

We believe it will provide you with some valuable insight that you might not be thinking of.

We do have different roles on campus and we do ask that you think about the student-athlete role.

We would like to promote the education and the explanation of all the issues surrounding these topics to the student-athletes who are currently on our campus. For those who will be on our campus in the future, this discussion will have to occur with prospective student-athletes because this issue will have a direct impact on them.

I love the comment earlier about being open-minded, because I know as we are having this conversation we do have our own opinions. But student-athletes' minds can be kind of blank, and it is fresh and it is new. As an administrator, when you are going to talk to your student-athletes, please be open-minded and present them with all the information and try not to force them to think the same way as everyone else.

Robert Leighton (University of New England): I also want to thank the working group for the work it has done. In particular, I want to thank Dan Fulks, who has told several of us that he has been doing most of the work of the group anyway. So a special thanks to Dan for that.

I want to comment about the voting. I assume that the vote that will most likely take place next year or the year after will be an Association-wide vote. I feel very uncomfortable that it is an Association-wide vote.

I have talked to many of my colleagues in Division II and in Division I, and they are not informed at all about what these issues are and how these issues affect Division III.

I understand the reason behind the Association-wide vote, but I think that people could also be creative and make it a division vote. This affects Division III almost entirely, and affects Division II a little bit with some movement that, by the way, Division II would accept.

They are more than happy to get new members, and it doesn't affect Division I at all.

I really wonder why there is a potential scenario in which Division III votes for the status quo only to have our vote overridden by a Division I and II vote for a change.

It just gives me more of a feeling that something is being forced upon Division III.

I encourage the working group, when the report goes back to the Executive Committee, to consider that and find some way to let Division III decide what happens to Division III.

From the Floor: Can I offer a point of clarification? Maybe I am asking a question.

It is my understanding that the total Association will only vote if the recommendation is for a Division IV. If there is a subdivision within Division IV, are we going to determine that we want to remain the same and that it does not rise to the level of an Association-wide vote?

Mr. Keeling: That is correct.

Tracey Ranieri (State University College at Oneonta): I would like to have some insight into this survey that has yet to be discussed.

In our round-table discussions, which were very helpful, we thought as we talked about change that we could ask our conferences if there is a possibility that we might look at our diversity and celebrate our change within that.

Would you talk about how we can change using that at the conference level?

Mr. Keeling: I think that will be part of the survey.

Joy Solomen (Rowan University): I want to add to a comment that someone on the committee made about taking the straw vote.

We really don't know what we are voting on. I would like to at least caution the committee to make sure that when and if there is a vote on this survey to divide that there should be a question to ask if we want restructuring.

And if there is restructuring, it needs to be clearly identified what each group is involved in.

I know that many times we have asked questions when they say things like students are encouraged to pursue more broad-based educational, co-curricular activities, there will be more monitoring.

These are things we are doing now. I want to know before I vote and make a decision exactly what is involved in my group.

People have asked if there will be championships. Will there be this, will there be that? The answer will be that your group will decide.

Those decisions need to be made clearly so that everybody can make a decision that we know is the right decision for this Association and for our institution.

Lastly, there was a comment made a couple of days ago that the actions of Division III will have a direct impact on Divisions I and II.

I am not sure what that means. Division I is under a moratorium. If you read USA Today, Division II has just opened its doors to Canada to expand its grouping.

Joel Cookson (Landmark Conference): Fact or fiction? The commissioners in Division I took a position yesterday that there would be no more funding for Division III. Do you have any knowledge about that?

Mr. Fry: It sounds like fiction to me. I will ask Dan if he knows anything specific about that meeting.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): As bad as my nightmares were last night, that was not included.

Mr. Cookson: How much of a say would that group have in funding for Division III?

Mr. Dutcher: I am glad you brought the funding question up, Joel.

To recap, the current funding allocations for Divisions II and III are constitutionally established. They were part of the overall package that was approved by the membership when the Association federated back in the mid-'90s.

For example, the 3.18 percent off the top of the Association's annual revenue stream that Division III receives is constitutionally guaranteed. That is about \$20 million this year. It includes about an annual eight percent escalated clause.

The funding percentages, roughly speaking, were negotiated as part of the overall package that permitted greater federation back in the mid-'90s.

The percentage that was allocated to Division III and to Division II represented the amount of the Association's budget at the time that it was being spent on championships.

There was an additional small incremental percentage increase for Division III to allow for growth, but roughly speaking that is how those initial percentages were established. Any change to the current allocation would have to be approved through some kind of legislative Association-wide initiative.

Those revenue percentages are included in the constitution and would take an Association-wide vote to change those allocations. Might those allocations be revisited in conjunction with the negotiation surrounding the next broadcasting agreement? That very well might happen.

Ultimately, the revenue allocations are constitutionally guaranteed and only the membership voting together with a two-thirds vote can change the constitution, just as only the membership getting together with a two-thirds vote could create a new division.

Mr. Keeling: I want to thank all of you for your patience and for your good questions. I hope this at least opens the dialogue. It gave us some points for discussion. We will have a full audio transcript of this session on the NCAA Web site. You can go back and refresh your memory on what is going on. In the next three or four weeks the survey will come out and we ask you to pay particular attention to those questions and answers and get them back as soon as possible.

Have a good trip home.

Mr. Fry: Rudy, thank you for facilitating this session.

We have one more item that we want to cover before we wrap this up — the drug education and testing pilot

program. This is a very important initiative that we have undertaken. We have put a lot of effort into it. We want to give you a quick report.

As most of you know, we are in the first year of a two-year drug education and testing pilot program.

Approximately 115 member schools are participating in this pilot on a voluntary basis to help us assess the extent to which substance use and abuse is an issue in Division III and how education and testing might further the health and safety of our student-athletes.

Mary Wilfert, the associate director of education services at the NCAA, and Mike Miranda, the faculty athletics representative at SUNY Plattsburgh who this year is serving as a research fellow in the national office, will present the report.

DRUG-TESTING AND EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM REPORT

Mary Wilfert (NCAA Staff): I am one of the liaisons in regard to safeguards.

To recap, we are in the two-year pilot as a result of a recommendation that came to the Management Council and the Presidents Council from competitive safeguards to institute year-round drug testing in Division III.

We test on campus year-round in Divisions I and II, and we test at championships in all three divisions.

I would like to applaud Division III for going forward with this pilot, especially in light of the renewed congressional interest in sports drug testing.

We are being called, along with other sports organizations, to testify before Congress in the coming weeks to talk about our testing programs. We are delighted that we are going to be able to talk about this part of it, too.

The purpose of the pilot is to enhance drug-use deterrence strategies and to provide Division III information about and experience with drug testing, especially in the event Division III would go to year-round testing, and to assess the impact of education and testing on drug use.

The two-year pilot began in August. All the schools in the pilot started with an assessment and conducted a pre-test to lay a foundation in order to gather data to assess the impact of testing and education.

There will be a post-test in April and May. That will be repeated again in year two with those schools that volunteered to participate and volunteered to be assigned to one of three groups.

The three groups participate in the educational portion of the pilot and then either in the NCAA testing portion or only the education portion for those schools that already did their own institutional testing.

As you can see (from the PowerPoint presentation), that's how the numbers broke out.

The schools that agreed to participate volunteered. One of the questions that came up is whether students who are part of the education and testing segment of the pilot also volunteered for testing. We approached that question by stating yes, it is voluntary, or no, because we wanted them to go through the true testing experience.

I will talk about that protocol in a minute.

Every school is participating in the education portion. Schools received a model checklist that outlined educational activities and a time line to follow through the academic year. At the end of that time line, they submitted the completed checklist and received the \$1,000 enhancement that the Management Council and Presidents Council provided for the pilot.

Also, schools in the pilot received materials to help them with education that included the drug-education and drug-testing video, the drug policies brochure and information about the service that answers questions about supplements, medications and banned substances.

The schools that are going through testing follow the same protocol that we follow in the Divisions I and II year-round testing program. They had to submit a calendar with dates that we could not send a crew to campus because they are on break or whatnot.

Once that calendar was received, that allowed for the drug-free sport company to schedule testing. Schools would be contacted 48 hours before the testing date and then had to submit rosters for one, two or three sports that were going to be tested.

Immediately, there would be a random draw of numbers that would be associated with the numbers on the roster of those student-athletes who had been selected for testing. Within the next 24 hours, they would notify

the student-athletes who would need to report for testing that next morning.

That is the protocol we use for year-round testing, and that is what we are using for the Division III pilot. So there's no more than a 48-hour notice for the schools to notify the student-athletes.

We are testing for all of the banned substances that we test for at NCAA championships. We do not test for street drugs in the year-round program in Divisions I and II, but Division III wanted to test for all performance-enhancement street drugs. Keep that in mind as we go to that data.

Again, we agreed it was a pilot. There are no sanctions. The results of the drug testing are reported in the broad aggregate to the individual institutions along with the total number of tests, the total number of positives and for what substance. So there would be no identification of a student-athlete who tested positive.

We are using the World Anti-Doping Agency lab in Utah. Testing began the first week of September.

If your school is involved and has already been tested, there is a potential for the NCAA to come back and test again going through that same process with the random draw from the squad list of the sports that are selected.

Again, a variety of sports in both men's and women's sports are being tested. As of December 7, we tested 46 schools and 899 student-athletes. The percentages I am showing you are from the results that have been fully analyzed and reported out. About half of what we have actually tested has been fully reported out.

So those positives are seven percent for street drugs that include THC, the active ingredient in marijuana and heroin. Cocaine is considered in the stimulant category. We had a six-percent positive result for stimulants.

What we see in our other testing is positive information for adderall and ritalin, the two stimulant medications that are widely prescribed for ADHD. We saw some of that in this testing.

In NCAA regular testing, we have the option for the student-athlete and the school to request a medical review if they come up positive for banned medication. In the pilot, that was not available because we are not reporting out individual positives. So we are not able to clarify what percentage of the stimulant positives would have been defined as approved medical exceptions.

Diuretics and masking agents are medications and/or drugs that are used to cover drug use. No-shows under the NCAA protocol are defined as a positive drug test and would carry the same penalties in a fully sanctioned program resulted in .70 percent.

We are in year one of the assessment. The present test is complete. The data have been collected from all pilot participants. The pre-test is designed to establish a baseline before drug-education testing programs. The sample of sports survey at each of the pilot schools included about 100 student-athletes. That same sample of sports will be tested; however, it will be a different set of student-athletes when we do the post-test.

That cycle will be repeated in year two. At the end of each year — in the fall following each year of the pilot — there will be another report on the data that have been collected from testing and from surveys so that the division can get a fuller picture of any relationship we are seeing at that point. So again, in the fall of 2008, there will be a report out and there will be another report in the fall of 2009.

Are there any questions?

Please note we do have two of our staff here who have been working with the education and survey part of the pilot. We are working very closely with the staff of drug-free sport for any of the logistics with drug testing.

Are there any questions?

Thank you very much.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Fry: Thank you, Mary. The Presidents and Management Councils will continue to closely monitor the progress of the pilot as we plan for future program initiatives related to this in Division III.

Let me do four housekeeping items before we adjourn.

First, remember that the final work product of Debbie's sabbatical project on integration, the best practices guide, is available at the resource table at the back of the room. It is a very good piece of work.

Secondly, we will make box lunches available after this session in Presidential Ballroom B, which is adjacent to this room.

The third, please remember the reception hosted by the Division III Administrators Association begins after this session in Washington B.

Finally, please remember to leave your voting units and paddles before you leave this meeting room.

Thank you very, very much for your attention and participation today.

We got a lot of good information.

We are adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.]

**ASSOCIATION-WIDE
2007-08 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

ORGANIZATION

Pursuant to NCAA Constitution 5.02.1.1 and 5.3.1.1, a dominant provision is a regulation that applies to all members of the Association and is of sufficient importance to the entire membership that it requires a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting in joint session at an annual or special Convention.

The voting for Proposal No. 2007-12, which would amend a dominant provision, will occur during the opening business session of the 2008 NCAA Convention.

In order to designate a voting delegate, the following procedure is applicable:

- a. The Appointment of Delegate form is found on the 2008 NCAA Convention Web site.
- b. An institution's president or chancellor (commissioner in case of a conference) must complete and submit the Appointment of Delegate form.
- c. An institution has discretion to select the delegate of its choice.
- d. In order to be appointed as a delegate, an individual must first be registered for the Convention.
- e. An e-mail will be automatically sent once a delegate has been assigned voting status.

NO. 2007-12

**ORGANIZATION — EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE — DUTIES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES**

Intent: To clarify the Executive Committee's existing authority to adopt and implement policy.

Constitution: Amend 4.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

4.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

[4.1.1 unchanged.]

4.1.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Executive Committee shall:

[4.1.2-(a) through 4.1.2-(d) unchanged.]

- (e) Act on behalf of the Association **by adopting and implementing policies** to resolve core issues and other Association-wide matters;

[4.1.2-(f) through 4.1.2-(m) unchanged.]

[Remainder of 4.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Division I Board of Directors).

Effective Date: Immediate

Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Organization

Rationale: The NCAA constitution charges the Executive Committee with overseeing Association-wide issues under Constitution Article 4.01.1. The constitution also charges that the Executive Committee, among other things, "shall act" on behalf of the Association to resolve core issues and Association-wide matters under Constitution Article 4.1.2. Under existing provisions of the constitution, the Executive Committee has authority to act by adopting and implementing policies. Presidents and chancellors on the Executive Committee are charged with providing such leadership and may do so by policy. The amendment does not change the duties and responsibilities of the Executive Committee. Neither does the amendment expand the Executive Committee's authority or power.

Estimated Budget Impact: None.

Estimated Time Impact: None.

History:

Aug 08, 2007 Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Aug 09, 2007 Sponsored by the NCAA Executive Committee and Division I Board of Directors.

Votes By Attendee

Page: 1
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Ablene Christian University	0040047025	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Adrian College	0040053798	OBS, Motion	1			
Alabama A&M University, FCS	0040053375	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Alabama State University, FCS	0040053384	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Albion College	0040054560	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Alcorn State University, FCS	0040053268	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Alderson-Broaddus College	0040053219	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Allegheny College	0040054513	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference	0040053803	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Alma College	0040052210	OBS, Motion		1		
		OBS, Test	1			
America East Conference	0040052238	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
American International College	0040051754	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
American Southwest Conference	0040052921	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Amherst College	0040054509	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Anderson University (South Carolina)	0040051887	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Angelo State University	0040051829	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Anna Maria College	0040052265	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Appalachian State University, FCS	0040052359	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Arkansas State University, FBS	0040052757	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Armstrong Atlantic State University	0040051830	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Assumption College	0040053071	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Atlantic 10 Conference	0040053539	OBS, Motion	1			
Atlantic Coast Conference	0040054585	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Augustana College (Illinois)	0040052201	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Austin College	0040052099	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Baldwin-Wallace College	0040052174	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Baptist Bible College	0040052175	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Bard College	0040052118	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Baruch College	0040052142	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Bates College	0040052232	OBS, Motion		1		
		OBS, Test			1	
Bay Path College	0040052250	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Bethel University (Minnesota)	0040052248	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Big East Conference, FBS	0040052310	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Big Ten Conference, FBS	0040054533	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Blackburn College	0040053542	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Bluffton University	0040053544	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Boston College, FBS	0040054716	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Boston University	0040053627	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Bowdoin College	0040053545	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Bowling Green State University, FBS	0040053629	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	0040052258	OBS, Motion	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 2
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	0040052258	OBS, Test	1			
Bridgewater State College	0040052085	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Brigham Young University, FBS	0040053642	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Brown University, FCS	0040054720	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Bryant University	0040054542	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Bucknell University, FCS	0040054711	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Buena Vista University	0040052126	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Buffalo State College	0040053504	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	0040054506	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Cabrini College	0040052189	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
California Institute of Technology	0040052180	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
California Lutheran University	0040052072	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
California State University (Chico)	0040053519	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
California State University (East Bay)	0040052177	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
California State University (Fresno), FBS	0040054661	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
California State University (Fullerton)	0040052320	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
California State University (Northridge)	0040053748	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
California University of Pennsylvania	0040053802	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Campbell University	0040052196	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Canisius College	0040054576	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Capital University	0040052095	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Carleton College	0040052150	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Carnegie Mellon University	0040052172	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Catholic University	0040052193	OBS, Test	1			
Cazenovia College	0040052086	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Cedar Crest College	0040052090	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Centenary College (New Jersey)	0040052089	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference	0040053408	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	0040048026	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Chaminade University	0040053815	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	0040052135	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Christopher Newport University	0040052243	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
City College of New York	0040052123	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	0040053532	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Clark Atlanta University	0040053458	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Clark University (Massachusetts)	0040052255	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Clarkson University	0040052329	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Clayton State University	0040053773	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Clemson University, FBS	0040052730	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Coker College	0040052930	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Colby-Sawyer College	0040052166	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 3
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Colgate University, FCS	0040052722	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
College of Mount St. Joseph	0040052053	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
College of Mount St. Vincent	0040052120	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	0040052314	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
College of Saint Rose	0040053749	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
College of St. Catherine	0040052227	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
College of St. Scholastica	0040052228	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
College of the Holy Cross, FCS	0040052371	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Colorado College	0040054657	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Colorado School of Mines	0040052060	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Colorado State University-Pueblo	0040054503	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Columbia University-Barnard College, FCS	0040053610	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Columbus State University	0040052341	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Commonwealth Coast Conference	0040054572	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Concordia University Texas	0040054643	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Conference USA, FBS	0040052186	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Converse College	0040053522	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Cornell University, FCS	0040053609	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Curry College	0040054714	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Dartmouth College, FCS	0040052368	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Davidson College, FCS	0040052732	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Davis and Elkins College	0040053513	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Defiance College	0040052936	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Delaware State University, FCS	0040054629	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
DePauw University	0040052723	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
DeSales University	0040054669	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Dowling College	0040052342	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Drew University	0040054652	OBS, Motion			1	
		OBS, Test		1		
Duquesne University, FCS	0040054692	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
D'Youville College	0040054654	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
East Central University	0040053840	OBS, Motion	1			
East Coast Conference	0040051826	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	0040054545	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Eastern Connecticut State University	0040054651	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Eastern Mennonite University	0040054655	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Eastern Michigan University, FBS	0040052717	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Eastern University	0040054649	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Eckerd College	0040054579	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Edgewood College	0040053796	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Elmira College	0040054575	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 4
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Elon University, FCS	0040053635	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Emerson College	0040053774	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Emory and Henry College	0040052149	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Endicott College	0040052214	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Fairfield University	0040052735	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Florham)	0040052332	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Fairmont State University	0040054445	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Felician College	0040052191	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Fitchburg State College	0040054450	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Florida A&M University, FCS	0040052220	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Florida Institute of Technology	0040052119	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Florida International University, FBS	0040054429	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Florida Southern College	0040053508	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Fort Lewis College	0040052102	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Framingham State College	0040052218	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Francis Marion University	0040053716	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Franklin & Marshall College	0040052153	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Frostburg State University	0040052134	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Furman University, FCS	0040053625	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Gallaudet University	0040052057	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Gannon University	0040053805	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
George Fox University	0040052366	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Georgetown University, FCS	0040053608	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Georgia College & State University	0040053776	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Georgia Southern University, FCS	0040054730	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Gettysburg College	0040052240	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Glenville State College	0040054401	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Goucher College	0040054461	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Grambling State University, FCS	0040053612	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Grand Valley State University	0040054536	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Great Northwest Athletic Conference	0040051819	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Green Mountain College	0040053841	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Greensboro College	0040052245	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Gustavus Adolphus College	0040052078	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Gwynedd-Mercy College	0040052187	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Hamilton College	0040054480	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Hampden-Sydney College	0040053755	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Hampton University, FCS	0040054630	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Hanover College	0040054395	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Hartwick College	0040052751	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 5
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Harvard University, FCS	0040052354	OBS, Motion			1	
		OBS, Test			1	
Haverford College	0040054393	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Heidelberg College	0040053740	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Hilbert College	0040054558	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Horizon League	0040053762	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Howard Payne University	0040054471	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Humboldt State University	0040053787	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Hunter College	0040054442	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Huntingdon College	0040054477	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Immaculata University	0040054457	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	0040054518	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Indiana University-Purdue University (Fort Wayne)	0040052352	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapol	0040052740	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Iona College, FCS	0040053378	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Iowa State University, FBS	0040054422	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Ivy Group, FCS	0040053525	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Jacksonville State University, FCS	0040054704	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
James Madison University, FCS	0040054637	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
John Carroll University	0040052163	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Johnson C. Smith University	0040052321	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Keene State College	0040054563	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Kent State University, FBS	0040054413	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Kentucky State University	0040054499	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Kentucky Wesleyan College	0040054562	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Keuka College	0040054399	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	0040053783	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
La Grange College	0040053813	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Lake Superior State University	0040052239	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Landmark Conference	0040054394	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Le Moyne College	0040052365	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Lebanon Valley College	0040053846	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Lees-McRae College	0040053778	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Lehigh University, FCS	0040052357	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Lehman College City University of New York	0040054566	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Lesley University	0040054496	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Lewis University	0040053747	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Limestone College	0040054538	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Lincoln Memorial University	0040054535	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Lincoln University (Missouri)	0040061315	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Livingstone College	0040061488	OBS, Motion	1			
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	0040061274	OBS, Motion	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 6
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	0040061274	OBS, Test		1		
Longwood University	0040054682	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Louisiana State University, FBS	0040052792	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Loyola University (Illinois)	0040052378	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Lynchburg College	0040052221	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Macalester College	0040052223	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Maine Maritime Academy	0040052225	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	0040061098	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Marietta College	0040053865	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Marist College, FCS	0040054451	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Mars Hill College	0040060833	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	0040053872	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0040053873	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	0040053874	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	0040053791	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
McDaniel College	0040053875	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Medaille College	0040053864	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Mercer University	0040054534	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Mercy College	0040008371	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Mercyhurst College	0040059708	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Meredith College	0040053852	OBS, Motion	1			
Methodist University	0040053854	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	0040054605	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Metropolitan State College of Denver	0040042267	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Michigan Intercol. Ath. Assn.	0040054382	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Michigan Technological University	0040060720	OBS, Motion	1			
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	0040048515	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1		1	
Mid-American Conference, FBS	0040052276	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Middle Tennessee State University, FBS	0040054408	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Middlebury College	0040053855	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conf., FCS	0040053786	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Millikin University	0040053856	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Mills College	0040053857	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Millsaps College	0040053858	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Milwaukee School of Engineering	0040053859	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	0040054514	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Minnesota State University (Mankato)	0040051107	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1			
Misericordia University	0040053860	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Mississippi College	0040053861	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Mississippi State University, FBS	0040052929	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		
Missouri Southern State University	0040058890	OBS, Motion OBS, Test	1	1		

Votes By Attendee

Page:
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Missouri State University, FCS	0040052161	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Missouri Uni of Science and Technology	0040047533	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Missouri Valley Conference	0040054415	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Missouri Western State University	0040059559	OBS, Test			1	
Molloy College	0040047095	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Monmouth University, FCS	0040053790	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Montana State University-Billings	0040059216	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Montana State University-Bozeman, FCS	0040052075	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Montclair State University	0040053863	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Moravian College	0040053877	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Mount Holyoke College	0040053878	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Mount Ida College	0040053879	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Mount Olive College	0040058037	OBS, Motion	1			
Mount St. Mary's University	0040053769	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Mount Union College	0040052145	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Mountain West Conference, FBS	0040053826	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Muskingum College	0040053741	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Nazareth College	0040053849	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Neumann College	0040054578	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
New Jersey Athletic Conference	0040054510	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
New Mexico Highlands University	0040042222	OBS, Motion			1	
New Mexico State University, FBS	0040054410	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Newbury College	0040053521	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Nichols College	0040054465	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Norfolk State University, FCS	0040053718	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
North Atlantic Conference	0040054511	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
North Carolina State University, FBS	0040052789	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
North Eastern Athletic Conference	0040053715	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
North Georgia College & State University	0040058243	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
North Park University	0040053528	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test				
Northeast Conference, FCS	0040052183	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Northeast-10 Conference	0040053400	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Northern Arizona University, FCS	0040054456	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Northern Kentucky University	0040061161	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Northern Michigan University	0040041077	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Northern State University	0040058019	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Northland College	0040053503	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Northwest Conference	0040052181	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Northwest Missouri State University	0040061474	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Norwich University	0040053745	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Oakland University	0040053777	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 8
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Oglethorpe University	0040053564	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Ohio State University, FBS	0040054416	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Ohio Wesleyan University	0040053559	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Oklahoma State University, FBS	0040052774	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Old Dominion University	0040054512	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Oregon State University, FBS	0040054406	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Otterbein College	0040053560	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Pacific Lutheran University	0040053567	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Pacific-10 Conference, FBS	0040052334	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Patriot League, FCS	0040052188	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Peach Belt Conference	0040051890	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Penn State University (Altoona)	0040053569	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference	0040054614	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Pennsylvania State Univ. Erie (the Behrend College)	0040054541	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Pennsylvania State University, FBS	0040052707	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Pepperdine University	0040052128	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Pfeiffer University	0040060942	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Piedmont College	0040054672	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Pine Manor College	0040054671	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Plattsburgh State University of New York	0040052793	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Plymouth State University	0040054589	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	0040054591	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Prairie View A&M University, FCS	0040052338	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Princeton University, FCS	0040052164	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Principia College	0040054592	OBS, Motion	1			
Providence College	0040053730	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Radford University	0040054453	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Ramapo College	0040054593	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Randolph College	0040054594	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Randolph-Macon College	0040052926	OBS, Motion	1			
Regis College (Massachusetts)	0040052769	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Regis University (Colorado)	0040053801	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Rhodes College	0040052931	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Rice University, FBS	0040052773	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	0040054582	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Rider University	0040052063	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Rochester Institute of Technology	0040061250	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Rockhurst University	0040054539	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	0040058165	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Roger Williams University	0040040113	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Rollins College	0040054540	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	

Votes By Attendee

Page: 9
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	0040042862	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Rosemont College	0040047856	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Rust College	0040053123	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Rutgers State Univ of New Jersey (New Brunswick), R0040054411		OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Rutgers The State Univ. of New Jersey (Camden)	0040042324	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Sacred Heart University, FCS	0040053655	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Saint Joseph's University	0040054504	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Saint Leo University	0040053292	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Saint Louis University	0040052249	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Salem International University	0040053124	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Salem State College	0040053469	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Salisbury University	0040053180	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Salve Regina University	0040053286	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
San Diego State University, FBS	0040054719	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
San Jose State University, FBS	0040054718	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Savannah State University, FCS	0040053510	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Seattle Pacific University	0040053346	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Seattle University	0040053372	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Seton Hall University	0040053514	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Shepherd University	0040053302	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	0040053113	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Siena College	0040053106	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Simpson College	0040053347	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Smith College	0040053150	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Sonoma State University	0040053836	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
South Atlantic Conference	0040051757	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Southeast Missouri State University, FCS	0040054537	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Southeastern Conference, FBS	0040053726	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Southern Conference, FCS	0040052282	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Southern Connecticut State University	0040054490	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.	0040051803	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Southern Utah University, FCS	0040052492	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Southland Conference, FCS	0040053547	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Southwest Minnesota State University	0040054486	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Southwestern Athletic Conf., FCS	0040053548	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Southwestern University (Texas)	0040053162	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Spelman College	0040053121	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Springfield College	0040053145	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
St. Andrews Presbyterian College	0040054569	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
St. John Fisher College	0040053174	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 10
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
St. John's University (Minnesota)	0040051861	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
St. John's University (New York)	0040053753	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	0040053259	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
St. Joseph's College (Long Island)	0040060817	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
St. Lawrence University	0040053371	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	0040054387	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
St. Martin's University	0040054613	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
St. Mary's College of Maryland	0040053299	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
St. Paul's College	0040054611	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
St. Peter's College, FCS	0040054505	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
St. Thomas Aquinas College	0040053737	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Stanford University, FBS	0040052798	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
State University College at Brockport	0040053324	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
State University College at Cortland	0040053293	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
State University College at Fredonia	0040053241	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
State University College at Geneseo	0040053166	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
State University College at New Paltz	0040053262	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
State University College at Oneonta	0040053524	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
State University of New York at Binghamton	0040053736	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
State University of New York at Oswego	0040053723	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
State University of New York Athletic Conference	0040053792	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
State University of New York Maritime College	0040052148	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Stetson University	0040052313	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Stevens Institute of Technology	0040053712	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Stillman College	0040054603	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Stonehill College	0040054602	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Sul Ross State University	0040054622	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Sun Belt Conference, FBS	0040053533	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Sunshine State Conference	0040051825	OBS, Motion	1			
Susquehanna University	0040052058	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Swarthmore College	0040054623	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Sweet Briar College	0040053834	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Syracuse University, FBS	0040052770	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Tennessee Technological University, FCS	0040053733	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Texas A&M University (College Station), FBS	0040052743	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Texas A&M University-Commerce	0040052151	OBS, Motion			1	
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	0040053656	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	0040052121	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Texas Christian University, FBS	0040052941	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Texas Southern University, FCS	0040053780	OBS, Test		1		
Texas State University-San Marcos, FCS	0040054403	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	

Votes By Attendee

Page: 11
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
The Summit League	0040054691	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Thiel College	0040054391	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Thomas More College	0040053725	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Transylvania University	0040009894	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Trinity College (District of Columbia)	0040053829	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Trinity University (Texas)	0040052131	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Troy University, FBS	0040052739	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Truman State University	0040052270	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Tuskegee University	0040052259	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	0040052280	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
U.S. Military Academy, FBS	0040052744	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
U.S. Naval Academy, FBS	0040054721	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Union College (New York)	0040052498	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University at Albany, FCS	0040052263	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University at Buffalo (the State University of New), FB	0040052742	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University Athletic Association	0040053775	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Alabama at Birmingham, FBS	0040053591	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Arizona, FBS	0040053593	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Arkansas (Fayetteville), FBS	0040053594	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Bridgeport	0040054556	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of California (Davis), FCS	0040052096	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of California (Los Angeles), FBS	0040053596	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of California (San Diego)	0040054555	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of California (Santa Barbara)	0040052293	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of California (Santa Cruz)	0040054469	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Central Florida, FBS	0040053597	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Charleston (West Virginia)	0040054554	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Chicago	0040052065	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Connecticut, FBS	0040054676	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Dallas	0040052147	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Dayton, FCS	0040052097	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Georgia, FBS	0040054678	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Hartford	0040054384	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Hawaii (Manoa), FBS	0040052715	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Kansas, FBS	0040053573	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Louisville, FBS	0040053577	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Maine (Farmington)	0040052144	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Maine (Orono), FCS	0040052497	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Mary	0040052256	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Mary Washington	0040052136	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 12
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Maryland (College Park), FBS	0040053578	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Maryland (Eastern Shore)	0040053817	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Massachusetts (Amherst), FCS	0040052264	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Massachusetts (Boston)	0040054618	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Miami (Florida), FBS	0040053580	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Michigan, FBS	0040053581	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Minnesota (Twin Cities), FBS	0040053582	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Mississippi, FBS	0040053583	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Missouri (Columbia), FBS	0040053584	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Missouri (Kansas City)	0040053518	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Missouri (St. Louis)	0040061000	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Montana, FCS	0040052082	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Nevada, FBS	0040053586	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of New Hampshire, FCS	0040052054	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of New Haven	0040052379	OBS, Motion	1			
University of New Mexico, FBS	0040053588	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of North Carolina (Asheville)	0040053843	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of North Carolina (Charlotte)	0040054482	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of North Carolina (Wilmington)	0040054449	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	0040052195	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of North Dakota	0040060659	OBS, Motion		1		
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Oklahoma, FBS	0040052794	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Oregon, FBS	0040054426	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Pennsylvania, FCS	0040052206	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Pittsburgh (Bradford)	0040053719	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Pittsburgh (Johnstown)	0040060914	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Pittsburgh, FBS	0040052716	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Portland	0040054396	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Puerto Rico (Bayamon)	0040061444	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Puerto Rico (Cayey)	0040047916	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Puerto Rico (Mayaguez Campus)	0040058189	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test				
University of Puerto Rico (Rio Piedras)	0040061351	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Puget Sound	0040052093	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of San Diego, FCS	0040052364	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of South Carolina (Columbia), FBS	0040052938	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of South Carolina Aiken	0040058199	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of South Dakota	0040060638	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Southern California, FBS	0040052922	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	0040053526	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Tennessee (Knoxville), FBS	0040053601	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Texas (Pan American)	0040053557	OBS, Motion	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 13
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Texas (Pan American)	0040053557	OBS, Test		1		
University of Texas at Arlington	0040052141	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Texas at Austin, FBS	0040052347	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Texas at Dallas	0040052160	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Texas at El Paso, FBS	0040052348	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Texas at San Antonio	0040052079	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Texas at Tyler	0040053734	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of the District of Columbia	0040042941	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of the Pacific	0040052362	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of the Sciences in Philadelphia	0040060562	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Utah, FBS	0040052345	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
University of Vermont	0040053566	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of West Florida	0040053613	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Wisconsin (Eau Claire)	0040053312	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Wisconsin (Madison), FBS	0040053604	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
University of Wisconsin (Stout)	0040053295	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
University of Wyoming, FBS	0040053605	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Upper Iowa University	0040061485	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
USA South Athletic Conference	0040053653	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Utica College	0040053415	OBS, Motion			1	
		OBS, Test		1		
Vanderbilt University, FBS	0040053638	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Virginia State University	0040061487	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Virginia Wesleyan College	0040053084	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Wagner College, FCS	0040052395	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wake Forest University, FBS	0040053639	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Washington and Lee University	0040053176	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Washington State University, FBS	0040053721	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Waynesburg University	0040061589	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Weber State University, FCS	0040053614	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Webster University	0040053188	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wellesley College	0040053318	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wells College	0040052705	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wentworth Institute of Technology	0040053439	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	0040053214	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	0040053425	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	0040061480	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
West Coast Conference	0040054666	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
West Texas A&M University	0040061482	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
West Virginia State University	0040061048	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
West Virginia University, FBS	0040052728	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Western Kentucky University, FCS	0040052386	OBS, Motion	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 14
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 16:03

Meeting: Opening Business Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Western Kentucky University, FCS	0040052386	OBS, Test	1			
Western Michigan University, FBS	0040054642	OBS, Motion	1			
Western New England College	0040053437	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Western Oregon University	0040061379	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Westfield State College	0040053257	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	0040053270	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wheeling Jesuit University	0040060742	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wheelock College	0040051868	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Whittier College	0040053089	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wichita State University	0040053555	OBS, Motion	1			
Wilkes University	0040051765	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Willamette University	0040053435	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
William Paterson University of New Jersey	0040053129	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wilson College	0040053410	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Wingate University	0040061305	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
Winthrop University	0040053553	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Wittenberg University	0040057945	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Wofford College, FCS	0040052396	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Worcester State College	0040061567	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test			1	
Xavier University	0040053551	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Yale University, FCS	0040052207	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test		1		
York College (Pennsylvania)	0040061526	OBS, Motion	1			
		OBS, Test	1			
Total		OBS, Motion	535	4	5	
		OBS, Test	224	194	111	

OVERRIDE VOTE

Pursuant to NCAA Constitution 5.3.2.3, upon receipt of 30 (15 for a football championship subdivision-only issue) requests for an override vote, the adoption of a legislative change or the failure of a legislative change shall be subject to a vote taken by the membership.

The proposals in this section received a sufficient number of override requests and are subject to the membership vote.

The resulting override vote will occur during the Division I business session, which will be conducted at the conclusion of the legislative forum on Saturday, January 12, 2008. At least a five-eighths majority vote of individual active members present (including multisport conference members in the governance structure) and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors. The vote shall be based on the principle of one institution, one vote and the vote shall be taken by roll call electronically. A “yes” vote will indicate support for the override. A “no” vote will indicate support for the action taken by the Board of Directors.

An override of the Board’s legislative action by vote of the membership shall be effective upon adjournment of the business session in which the vote occurs.

In order to designate a voting delegate, the following procedure is applicable:

- a. The Appointment of Delegate form is found on the 2008 NCAA Convention Web site.
- b. An institution’s president or chancellor (commissioner in case of a conference) must complete and submit the Appointment of Delegate form.
- c. An institution has discretion to select the delegate of its choice.
- d. In order to be appointed as a delegate, an individual must first be registered for the Convention.
- e. An e-mail will be automatically sent once a delegate has been assigned voting status.

NO. 2006-40

RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

Intent: To specify that electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent to a prospective student-athlete is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.14, as follows:

13.02.14 Telephone Calls. All electronically transmitted human voice exchange (including videoconferencing and video-phones) shall be considered telephone calls. All electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail, *Instant Messenger*, facsimiles, *pages*, *text messaging*) shall not be considered telephone calls (see Bylaw 13.4.1).

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1.2, as follows:

13.4.1.2 Electronic Transmissions. Electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., *electronic mail*, *Instant Messenger*, *facsimiles*, *pages*, *text messaging*) **that** may be sent to a prospective student-athlete **is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles. All other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., Instant Messenger, text messaging) are prohibited.** Color attachments may be included with electronic mail correspondence sent to a prospective student-athlete, provided the attachment does not include any animation, audio or video clips and there is no cost (e.g., subscription fee) associated with sending the item attached to the electronic mail correspondence.

Source: The Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Recruiting

Rationale: The unlimited use of certain forms of electronic communication, such as instant and text messaging, to contact prospects has become problematic. Coaches feel compelled to contact prospects constantly; prospects are distracted at all hours of the day and night and prospects and their parents are bearing the significant costs involved with receiving text messages. In addition, instant and text messaging further removes the parents and the high school coaches from the recruiting process. Prohibiting institutions from sending these intrusive and impersonal forms of electronic communication to prospects and returning to the use of weekly telephone conversations, electronic mail sent to computers, and written correspondence will reduce the burdens that have been created with the overuse of text messaging sent to cell phones and other portable electronic communication devices.

Estimated Budget Impact: Potential for savings of time and money on text messaging.

Impact on Student Athlete's Time: Prospects will not be disrupted by multiple text messages.

Position Statement(s):

Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet: The cabinet unanimously opposes Proposal No. 2006-40. Limiting the use of electronic communication to electronic mail and facsimiles eliminates other very efficient and cost effective methods of communicating with prospective student-athletes (e.g., text messaging, instant messenger). Although a certain level of intrusion exists in permitting these other forms of communication, a better approach is to adopt reasonable restrictions that will promote efficiency in the recruiting process and control the intrusion factor. The WBCA has expressed strong opposition to the proposal.

Football Issues Committee: The committee opposes the proposal.

Men's Basketball Issues Committee: The committee opposes the proposal, noting concerns about limiting accepted modes of communication used in today's culture and defining exactly what constitutes electronic mail.

Women's Basketball Issues Committee: While the committee noted the WBCA originally sponsored a similar proposal as part of its Recruiting and Access Legislative Package, the committee opposes the legislation finding it too restrictive given recent advances in technology. It was noted that both prospects and coaches regularly communicate via electronic means beyond e-mail and facsimiles within their day-to-day lives and restricting those forms of communication within the recruiting process does not seem efficient or productive.

History:

Jul 15, 2006 Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Aug 22, 2006 Women's Basketball Issues Committee, Recommends Defeat; See position statement.

Aug 25, 2006 Men's Basketball Issues Committee, Recommends Defeat; See position statement.

Sep 05, 2006 Football Issues Committee, Recommends Defeat

Sep 08, 2006 Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet, Recommends Defeat; See position statement.

Jan 07, 2007 Mgmt Council 1st Review, Forwarded for Membership Comment

Jan 09, 2007 Comment Period; Start of Comment Period

Mar 09, 2007 Comment Period; End of Comment Period; (Official Comment Totals: Support = 11, Oppose = 17, Abstain = 2)

Apr 16, 2007 Mgmt Council 2nd Review - (Yea=32, Nay=17, Abstain=0, Not Present=0)

Apr 26, 2007 Board Consideration, Adopted - (Yea=13, Nay=3, Abstain=0, Not Present=0)

Apr 27, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Jun 25, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 34)

Jun 26, 2007 Board Review; Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its August 2007 meeting.

Aug 09, 2007 Board Review; Upheld adoption. Override vote by Division I membership will occur during the Division I Business Session scheduled for Saturday, January 12 at the 2008 NCAA Convention.

Intent: In golf, to permit an institution to participate in a total of nine three-day tournaments (with a maximum of 54 holes per tournament) or 24 dates of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5, as follows:

17.12.5 Number of Dates of Competition.

17.12.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A **In men's golf, a** member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in golf during the permissible golf playing season to **nine three-day tournaments (with a maximum of 54 holes per tournament) or 24 dates of competition.** **In women's golf a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in golf during the permissible golf playing season to 24 dates of competition. except for those Those** dates of competition **or tournaments excluded** under Bylaw 17.12.5.2, 17.12.5.3 and 17.12.5.4 **are excluded from the limitations** (see Bylaw 20.9.4.3 for minimum contests and participants requirements).

[17.12.5.1.1 through 17.12.5.1.3 unchanged.]

17.12.5.1.4 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. **An In men's golf, an** individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than **nine three-day tournaments (with a maximum of 54 holes per tournament) or 24 dates of competition. In women's golf, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 24 dates of competition. in golf (this This** limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.).

[Remainder of 17.12.5 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5, as follows:

17.12.5 Number of Dates of Competition.

17.12.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A **In women's golf, a** member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in golf during the permissible golf playing season to **nine three-day tournaments (with a maximum of 54 holes per tournament) or 24 dates of competition.** **In men's golf a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in golf dur-**

ing the permissible golf playing season to 24 dates of competition. except for those Those dates of competition **or tournaments excluded** under Bylaw 17.12.5.2, 17.12.5.3 and 17.12.5.4 **are excluded from the limitations** (see Bylaw 20.9.4.3 for minimum contests and participants requirements).

[17.12.5.1.1 through 17.12.5.1.3 unchanged.]

17.12.5.1.4 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. **An In women's golf, an** individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than **nine three-day tournaments (with a maximum of 54 holes per tournament) or 24 dates of competition. In men's golf, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 24 dates of competition. in golf (this This** limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.).

[Remainder of 17.12.5 unchanged.]

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference and Southeastern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Playing and Practice Seasons

Rationale: The dates of competition in golf were reduced in 1991 from 30 to 24. Since that time, many tournaments changed from three-day events (54 holes with 18 holes per day) to two-day events (54 holes with 36 holes on day one; 18 holes on day two). The change to two-day events has had negative effects on student-athlete well-being, tournament administration and budgetary issues. In order to play 36 holes in one day, a 14-hour day is usually required. More tournaments are being played during the weekdays, rather than weekends, because a golf club is required to dedicate its entire course to the tournament on the first day. Another consequence is additional missed class time. Playing in 12 two-day tournaments rather than nine three-day tournaments typically results in more travel expenses. Under this proposal, many teams would reduce their tournaments by one, and thereby reduce their costs by one event. In addition, student-athlete experience would be enhanced by reducing the fatigue of playing 36 holes on one day. More golf courses would potentially consider hosting events on weekends, since they would not have to close the course for an entire day, thus resulting in less missed class time for the student-athletes.

Estimated Budget Impact: Nine tournaments will result in one to three fewer events during the season.

Impact on Student Athlete's Time: May result in fewer events and less missed class time.

Position Statement(s)

Championships/Competition Cabinet: The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2006-87.

History:

Jul 06, 2006 Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Sep 21, 2006 Championships/Competition Cabinet, Recommends Approval

Jan 07, 2007 Mgmt Council 1st Review, Forwarded for Membership Comment

Jan 09, 2007 Comment Period; Start of Comment Period

Mar 09, 2007 Comment Period; End of Comment Period; (Official Comment Totals: Support = 7, Oppose = 30, Abstain = 2)

Apr 16, 2007 Mgmt Council 2nd Review, Approved - (Yea=34.5, Nay=12.5, Abstain=0, Not Present=2)

Apr 26, 2007 Board Consideration, Adopted

Apr 27, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Jun 25, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 69)

Jun 26, 2007 Board Review; Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its August 2007 meeting.

Aug 09, 2007 Board Review; Upheld adoption. Override vote by Division I membership will occur during the Division I Business Session scheduled for Saturday, January 12 at the 2008 NCAA Convention.

NO. 2007-9	FINANCIAL AID AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT — SQUAD SIZE LIMITATION — BASEBALL (As Amended)
-------------------	---

Intent: To specify that: (a) there shall be an annual limit of 11.7 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 27 (30 in 2008-09) on the total number of counters in baseball at each institution; (b) an institution shall provide each counter athletically related and other countable financial aid that is equal to or greater than 25 percent of an equivalency; and (c) an institution shall declare, by the day prior to its first scheduled contest in the championship segment of the playing and practice season, a squad of a maximum of 35 student-athletes who shall be eligible to participate in countable athletically related activities during the remainder of the championship segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.5, as follows:

15.5 MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT

[15.5.1 through 15.5.2, unchanged.]

15.5.3 Equivalency Sports.

15.5.3.1 Maximum Equivalency Limits

15.5.3.1.1 Men's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per Bylaw 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following men's sports:

Baseball *11.7*

[All other sports unchanged.]

[Remainder of 15.5.3 unchanged.]

15.5.4 Baseball Limitations. During the 2008-09 academic year, there shall be a limit of 11.7 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and a limit of 30 on the total number of counters, in baseball at each institution. During the 2009-10 academic year and thereafter, there shall be an annual limit of 11.7 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 27 on the total number of counters in baseball at each institution.

15.5.4.1 Minimum Equivalency Value. An institution shall provide each counter athletically related and other countable financial aid that is equal to or greater than 25 percent of an equivalency.

[15.5.4 through 15.5.11 renumbered as 15.5.5 through 15.5.12, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.8, as follows:

17.4.8 Other Restrictions.

[17.4.8.1 through 17.4.8.2 unchanged.]

17.4.8.3 Squad Size Limitation — Championship Segment. An institution shall declare a varsity squad of a maximum of 35 student-athletes by the day prior to its first scheduled contest in the championship segment of the playing and practice season. Only those student-athletes who are declared as varsity squad members at that time shall be eligible to participate in countable athletically related activities with the varsity squad during the remainder of the championship segment. Declared varsity squad members shall not participate in countable athletically related activities with an institution's subvarsity team (e.g., freshman, junior varsity). A student-athlete who is a counter (per Bylaw 15.5.1) must be included in the varsity squad limit.

Source: NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008 (25 percent minimum equivalency requirement effective for student-athletes who initially enroll full time at the certifying institution on or after August 1, 2008).

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Financial Aid

Rationale: The average number of baseball student-athletes receiving athletics aid among Division I baseball programs is 27, however, there are some programs that annually exceed as many as 40 baseball student-athletes receiving some portion of aid. A minimum award of athletically related and other countable financial aid at 25% of an equivalency ensures an appropriate balance between addressing student-athlete well-being for those reluctant to serve a year of transfer residence and the ability of baseball coaches to effectively and efficiently manage distribution of 11.7 equivalencies. Requiring the 25% minimum helps ensure the baseball program is truly committed to the student-athlete, thereby encouraging more responsible recruiting and making it less likely for coaches to facilitate transfers of student-athletes to whom they are significantly committed financially. Coaches will be less likely to employ a “run-off” strategy of squad size maintenance after having what amounts to a fall term tryout if the number of counters is limited at the outset. Encouraging a student-athlete who is one of 27 counters to transfer during the academic year will not only cost that institution NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate points, but the institution will not be able to replace that student-athlete with another counter.

Estimated Budget Impact: None.

Impact on Student Athlete’s Time: None.

History:

Apr 25, 2007 Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Apr 26, 2007 Board Consideration, Adopted

Apr 27, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Jun 25, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 72)

Jun 26, 2007 Board Review; Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its August 2007 meeting.

Aug 09, 2007 Board Review, Adopted; The Board amended the proposal to specify that an institution shall provide each counter athletically related and other countable financial aid that is equal to or greater than 25 percent of an equivalency. The Board then adopted the proposal as amended. Previously, the proposal required a 33 percent minimum value based only on athletically related financial aid.

Aug 10, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Oct 08, 2007 Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 56)

Oct 09, 2007 Board Review; Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its November 1, 2007 meeting.

Nov 01, 2007 Board Review; Upheld adoption. Override vote by Division I membership will occur during the Division I Business Session scheduled for Saturday, January 12 at the 2008 NCAA Convention.

Votes By Attendee

Page: 15
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Alabama A&M University, FCS	0040053375	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Alabama State University, FCS	0040053384	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Alcorn State University, FCS	0040053268	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test				
America East Conference	0040052238	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
American University	0040054697	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Appalachian State University, FCS	0040052359	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Arizona State University, FBS	0040052759	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Arkansas State University, FBS	0040052757	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Atlantic 10 Conference	0040053539	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Atlantic Coast Conference	0040054585	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Atlantic Sun Conference	0040054543	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Auburn University, FBS	0040052772	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Austin Peay State University, FCS	0040052734	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
Ball State University, FBS	0040053634	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Baylor University, FBS	0040054663	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Belmont University	0040052350	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Big 12 Conference, FBS	0040054476	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 16
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Big 12 Conference, FBS	0040054476	Division I Test		1		
Big East Conference, FBS	0040052310	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Big Sky Conference, FCS	0040053848	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Big South Conference	0040054447	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Big Ten Conference, FBS	0040054533	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Big West Conference	0040054441	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Boston College, FBS	0040054716	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Boston University	0040053627	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Bowling Green State University, FBS	0040053629	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Bradley University	0040052370	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Brigham Young University, FBS	0040053642	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Brown University, FCS	0040054720	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Bucknell University, FCS	0040054711	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Butler University, FCS	0040053147	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
California Polytechnic State University, FCS	0040053626	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
California State University (Fresno), FBS	0040054661	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
California State University (Fullerton)	0040052320	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
California State University (Northridge)	0040053748	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 17
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
California State University (Northridge)	0040053748	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Campbell University	0040052196	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Canisius College	0040054576	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Central Connecticut State University, FCS	0040053646	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Central Michigan University, FBS	0040054662	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Charleston Southern University, FCS	0040053624	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Clemson University, FBS	0040052730	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Cleveland State University	0040054515	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Coastal Carolina University, FCS	0040052381	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Colgate University, FCS	0040052722	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
College of the Holy Cross, FCS	0040052371	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
College of William and Mary, FCS	0040052389	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Colonial Athletic Association, FCS	0040053549	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Columbia University-Barnard College, FCS	0040053610	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Conference USA, FBS	0040052186	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Cornell University, FCS	0040053609	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Dartmouth College, FCS	0040052368	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 18
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Dartmouth College, FCS	0040052368	Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Davidson College, FCS	0040052732	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Delaware State University, FCS	0040054629	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
DePaul University	0040052360	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Drake University, FCS	0040054628	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Duke University, FBS	0040054699	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Duquesne University, FCS	0040054692	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
East Tennessee State University	0040054700	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Eastern Illinois University, FCS	0040052390	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Eastern Kentucky University, FCS	0040052724	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Eastern Michigan University, FBS	0040052717	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Elon University, FCS	0040053635	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Fairfield University	0040052735	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Metropolitan)	0040054659	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Florida A&M University, FCS	0040052220	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Florida International University, FBS	0040054429	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Florida State University, FBS	0040052750	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Fordham University, FCS	0040053607	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 19
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Fordham University, FCS	0040053607	Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Furman University, FCS	0040053625	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
George Mason University	0040052369	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
George Washington University	0040052397	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Georgetown University, FCS	0040053608	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Georgia Institute of Technology, FBS	0040052796	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Georgia Southern University, FCS	0040054730	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Georgia State University	0040053628	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Grambling State University, FCS	0040053612	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Hampton University, FCS	0040054630	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Harvard University, FCS	0040052354	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
High Point University	0040053621	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Horizon League	0040053762	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Illinois State University, FCS	0040052367	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Indiana State University, FCS	0040053647	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Indiana University (Bloomington), FBS	0040052933	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Indiana University-Purdue University (Fort Wayne)	0040052352	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 20
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	0040052740	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Iona College, FCS	0040053378	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Iowa State University, FBS	0040054422	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Ivy Group, FCS	0040053525	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Jacksonville State University, FCS	0040054704	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Jacksonville University, FCS	0040053382	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
James Madison University, FCS	0040054637	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Kansas State University, FBS	0040052763	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Kent State University, FBS	0040054413	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
La Salle University, FCS	0040053287	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Lafayette College, FCS	0040053376	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Lamar University	0040052711	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Lehigh University, FCS	0040052357	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Liberty University, FCS	0040053828	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Lipscomb University	0040052727	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Long Beach State University	0040052377	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Longwood University	0040054682	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 21
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Longwood University	0040054682	Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Louisiana State University, FBS	0040052792	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Loyola College (Maryland)	0040054385	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
Loyola University (Illinois)	0040052378	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Manhattan College	0040054508	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Marist College, FCS	0040054451	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Marquette University	0040052775	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Marshall University, FBS	0040052713	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
McNeese State University, FCS	0040052139	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Mercer University	0040054534	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	0040054605	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Michigan State University, FBS	0040054428	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Mid-American Conference, FBS	0040052276	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Middle Tennessee State University, FBS	0040054408	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conf., FCS	0040053786	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Mississippi State University, FBS	0040052929	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Missouri State University, FCS	0040052161	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Missouri Valley Conference	0040054415	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 22
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Missouri Valley Conference	0040054415	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Monmouth University, FCS	0040053790	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Montana State University-Bozeman, FCS	0040052075	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Morehead State University, FCS	0040052155	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Mount St. Mary's University	0040053769	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Mountain West Conference, FBS	0040053826	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Murray State University, FCS	0040053606	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
New Mexico State University, FBS	0040054410	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Niagara University	0040054619	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Norfolk State University, FCS	0040053718	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
North Carolina State University, FBS	0040052789	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Northeast Conference, FCS	0040052183	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Northeastern University, FCS	0040053735	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Northern Arizona University, FCS	0040054456	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Northwestern University, FBS	0040054405	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Oakland University	0040053777	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Ohio State University, FBS	0040054416	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 23
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Ohio State University, FBS	0040054416	Division I Test		1		
Ohio University, FBS	0040052771	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Ohio Valley Conference, FCS	0040052056	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Oklahoma State University, FBS	0040052774	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Old Dominion University	0040054512	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Oral Roberts University	0040053739	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Oregon State University, FBS	0040054406	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Pacific-10 Conference, FBS	0040052334	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Patriot League, FCS	0040052188	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Pennsylvania State University, FBS	0040052707	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Pepperdine University	0040052128	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Prairie View A&M University, FCS	0040052338	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Princeton University, FCS	0040052164	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Providence College	0040053730	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Purdue University, FBS	0040052939	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
Quinnipiac University	0040054523	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Radford University	0040054453	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Rice University, FBS	0040052773	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 24
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Rice University, FBS	0040052773	Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Rider University	0040052063	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Robert Morris University, FCS	0040053506	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Rutgers State Univ of New Jersey (New Brunswick), R0040054411		Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Sacred Heart University, FCS	0040053655	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Saint Joseph's University	0040054504	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Saint Louis University	0040052249	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Samford University, FCS	0040052297	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
San Diego State University, FBS	0040054719	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
San Jose State University, FBS	0040054718	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Santa Clara University	0040052069	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Savannah State University, FCS	0040053510	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Seton Hall University	0040053514	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Siena College	0040053106	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Southeast Missouri State University, FCS	0040054537	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Southeastern Conference, FBS	0040053726	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Southeastern Louisiana University, FCS	0040052279	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 25
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Southern Conference, FCS	0040052282	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test			1	
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, FCS	0040052286	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Southern Methodist University, FBS	0040054701	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Southern Utah University, FCS	0040052492	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Southland Conference, FCS	0040053547	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Southwestern Athletic Conf., FCS	0040053548	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
St. Bonaventure University	0040053709	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
St. Francis College (New York)	0040054527	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
St. John's University (New York)	0040053753	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
St. Peter's College, FCS	0040054505	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Stanford University, FBS	0040052798	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
State University of New York at Binghamton	0040053736	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Stephen F. Austin State University, FCS	0040053706	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Stetson University	0040052313	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Stony Brook University, FCS	0040052122	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Sun Belt Conference, FBS	0040053533	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Syracuse University, FBS	0040052770	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	

Votes By Attendee

Page: 26
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Syracuse University, FBS	0040052770	Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
Temple University, FBS	0040052765	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Tennessee State University, FCS	0040052273	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
Tennessee Technological University, FCS	0040053733	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Texas A&M University (College Station), FBS	0040052743	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	0040053656	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Texas Christian University, FBS	0040052941	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Texas Southern University, FCS	0040053780	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Texas State University-San Marcos, FCS	0040054403	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Texas Tech University, FBS	0040053377	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
The Summit League	0040054691	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Towson University, FCS	0040054494	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Troy University, FBS	0040052739	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
U.S. Air Force Academy, FBS	0040054702	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
U.S. Military Academy, FBS	0040052744	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
U.S. Naval Academy, FBS	0040054721	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University at Albany, FCS	0040052263	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University at Buffalo (the State University of New), FB0040052742		Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	

Votes By Attendee

Page: 27
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University at Buffalo (the State University of New), FB0040052742		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Akron, FBS	0040053590	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Alabama (Tuscaloosa), FBS	0040053592	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
University of Alabama at Birmingham, FBS	0040053591	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Arizona, FBS	0040053593	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Arkansas (Fayetteville), FBS	0040053594	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Arkansas (Little Rock)	0040054615	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Arkansas (Pine Bluff), FCS	0040052261	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
University of California (Davis), FCS	0040052096	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of California (Irvine)	0040054577	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of California (Los Angeles), FBS	0040053596	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of California (Riverside)	0040053630	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
University of California (Santa Barbara)	0040052293	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Central Florida, FBS	0040053597	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Cincinnati, FBS	0040053598	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Colorado (Boulder), FBS	0040053599	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of Connecticut, FBS	0040054676	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Dayton, FCS	0040052097	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 28
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Dayton, FCS	0040052097	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
University of Delaware, FCS	0040052317	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Denver	0040053515	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Detroit Mercy	0040052296	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of Evansville	0040052080	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Florida, FBS	0040054679	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Georgia, FBS	0040054678	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Hartford	0040054384	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Hawaii (Manoa), FBS	0040052715	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Houston, FBS	0040053603	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Illinois (Champaign), FBS	0040053571	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Iowa, FBS	0040053572	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Kansas, FBS	0040053573	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Kentucky, FBS	0040053574	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Louisiana at Lafayette, FBS	0040053575	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Louisiana at Monroe, FBS	0040053576	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Louisville, FBS	0040053577	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 29
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Louisville, FBS	0040053577	Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Maryland (Baltimore County)	0040054520	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Maryland (College Park), FBS	0040053578	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Maryland (Eastern Shore)	0040053817	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Massachusetts (Amherst), FCS	0040052264	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Memphis, FBS	0040053579	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Miami (Florida), FBS	0040053580	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Michigan, FBS	0040053581	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
University of Minnesota (Twin Cities), FBS	0040053582	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Mississippi, FBS	0040053583	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Missouri (Columbia), FBS	0040053584	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Missouri (Kansas City)	0040053518	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of Montana, FCS	0040052082	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Nebraska (Lincoln), FBS	0040053585	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Nevada (Las Vegas), FBS	0040053587	Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Nevada, FBS	0040053586	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of New Hampshire, FCS	0040052054	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of New Mexico, FBS	0040053588	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 30
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of New Mexico, FBS	0040053588	Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of North Carolina (Asheville)	0040053843	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), FBS	0040053589	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test			1	
University of North Carolina (Charlotte)	0040054482	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of North Carolina (Wilmington)	0040054449	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test			1	
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	0040052195	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of North Dakota	0040060659	Division I Test		1		
University of North Texas, FBS	0040052754	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Northern Iowa, FCS	0040054723	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Notre Dame, FBS	0040052892	Division I, 2006 - 40			1	
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Oklahoma, FBS	0040052794	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Oregon, FBS	0040054426	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Pennsylvania, FCS	0040052206	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Pittsburgh, FBS	0040052716	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Portland	0040054396	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Rhode Island, FCS	0040053615	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Richmond, FCS	0040052393	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of San Diego, FCS	0040052364	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 31
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of San Diego, FCS	0040052364	Division I Test	1			
University of San Francisco	0040053360	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of South Carolina (Columbia), FBS	0040052938	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of South Florida, FBS	0040052758	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Southern California, FBS	0040052922	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Southern Mississippi, FBS	0040053600	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
University of Tennessee (Knoxville), FBS	0040053601	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Texas (Pan American)	0040053557	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Texas at Arlington	0040052141	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Texas at Austin, FBS	0040052347	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
University of Texas at El Paso, FBS	0040052348	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
University of Texas at San Antonio	0040052079	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of the Pacific	0040052362	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Toledo, FBS	0040052349	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
University of Utah, FBS	0040052345	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
University of Vermont	0040053566	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Virginia, FBS	0040052107	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Washington, FBS	0040053649	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 32
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Washington, FBS	0040053649	Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Wisconsin (Green Bay)	0040053565	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Wisconsin (Madison), FBS	0040053604	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)	0040053562	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
University of Wyoming, FBS	0040053605	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test	1			
Utah State University, FBS	0040053637	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)			1	
		Division I Test		1		
Valparaiso University, FCS	0040052399	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Vanderbilt University, FBS	0040053638	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Villanova University, FCS	0040054708	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Virginia Commonwealth University	0040053563	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Virginia Military Institute, FCS	0040052375	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Wagner College, FCS	0040052395	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Wake Forest University, FBS	0040053639	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Washington State University, FBS	0040053721	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Weber State University, FCS	0040053614	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
West Coast Conference	0040054666	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
West Virginia University, FBS	0040052728	Division I, 2006 - 40	1			
		Division I, 2006 - 87			1	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 33
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 1 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
West Virginia University, FBS	0040052728	Division I Test		1		
Western Athletic Conference, FBS	0040052289	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Western Kentucky University, FCS	0040052386	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Western Michigan University, FBS	0040054642	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
Wichita State University	0040053555	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Winthrop University	0040053553	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Wofford College, FCS	0040052396	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test		1		
Wright State University	0040053554	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Xavier University	0040053551	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)		1		
		Division I Test	1			
Yale University, FCS	0040052207	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)		1		
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test	1			
Youngstown State University, FCS	0040053619	Division I, 2006 - 40		1		
		Division I, 2006 - 87	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	1			
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	1			
		Division I Test		1		
Total		Division I, 2006 - 40	65	240	1	
		Division I, 2006 - 87	190	95	19	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (A)	87	200	21	
		Division I, 2007 - 9 (B)	69	213	23	
		Division I Test	61	230	10	

102nd Annual Convention
DIVISION II
LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS
SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals:

- Those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted;
- Those letters and words that appear in **bold** face are to be added; and
- Those letters and words that appear in normal text are unchanged from the current Division II legislation.]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE GROUPING

2008 NCAA Convention Division II Proposal No. EC-1 (No. 2-4) will be taken up during the opening business session at 4 p.m., Saturday, January 12. Voting delegates from members of the Association shall vote on this proposal, by roll-call vote, during the joint session.

**NO. EC-1 (NO. 2-4) ORGANIZATION — EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE — DUTIES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES**

Intent: To clarify the Executive Committee's existing authority to adopt and implement policy.

Constitution: Amend 4.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

4.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

[4.1.1 unchanged.]

4.1.2 Duties and Responsibilities.

[4.1.2-(a) through 4.1.2-(d) unchanged.]

(e) Act on behalf of the Association **by adopting and implementing policies** to resolve core issues and other Association-wide matters;

[4.1.2-(f) through 4.1.2-(m) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee [Division II Presidents Council (Management Council)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: The NCAA Constitution charges the Executive Committee with overseeing Association-wide issues under Constitution Article 4.01.1. The constitution also charges that the Executive Committee, among other things, "shall act" on behalf of the Association to resolve core issues and Association-wide matters under Constitution Article 4.1.2. Under existing provisions of the constitution, the Executive Committee has authority to act by adopting and implementing policies. Presidents and chancellors on the Executive Committee are

charged with providing such leadership and may do so by policy. The amendment does not change the duties and responsibilities of the Executive Committee. Neither does the amendment expand the Executive Committee's authority or power.

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II presidents or chancellors.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II presidents or chancellors and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 1 (NO. 2-2) NCAA MEMBERSHIP — MEMBER CONFERENCE — ELIGIBILITY — CONFERENCE OF AT LEAST SIX ACTIVE MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Intent: To establish a process for a conference of at least six active member institutions desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges, as follows: (1) Require submission of an application to the Membership Committee on or before December 1; (2) Require submission of information at the time of application, including a

conference strategic plan, a conference constitution and bylaws, documentation affirming the conference satisfies the sports sponsorship requirement, a business plan for conference office operations and a student-athlete advisory committee development plan; and (3) Require the conference commissioner to attend the NCAA Convention in the year immediately following the submission of the application.

Constitution: Amend 3.3, as follows:

3.3 MEMBER CONFERENCE.

3.3.1 Eligibility.

[3.3.1.1 through 3.3.1.2 unchanged.]

3.3.1.3 Provisional Membership Requirement Conference of At Least Six Active Member Institutions. A newly formed conference of at least six active member institutions desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges must complete a provisional membership period prior to becoming eligible for election. A conference that forms with six or more active members must complete a two-year provisional membership period. A conference that forms with fewer than six active members must complete a four-year provisional membership period. **meet the following conditions:**

(a) Submit an application to the Membership Committee, to be received in the national office not later than December 1. The following information must be submitted at the time of application:

- (1) A conference strategic plan;**
- (2) A conference constitution and bylaws;**
- (3) Documentation affirming the conference satisfies the sports sponsorship requirement;**
- (4) A business plan for conference office operations; and**
- (5) A student-athlete advisory committee development plan.**

Once the application is approved by the Membership Committee, a conference of at least six active member institutions shall be eligible for privileges of active member conferences, except for automatic qualification (see Bylaws 31.3.4.3 and 31.3.4.5); and

(b) The conference commissioner must attend the NCAA Convention in the year immediately following the submission of the application.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Newly formed conferences that consist of at least six active member institutions must demonstrate their long-term stability and viability before being considered an active conference. Such conferences will be required to submit information that illustrates the planning and development of the conference. In addition, requiring a newly formed conference to submit an application by December 1 will allow the conference to send its commissioner to the NCAA Convention the following year in January to begin to learn the issues confronting the division. Finally, a newly formed conference will attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges on approval of the application by the Membership Committee. However, the conference shall not attain an automatic qualification for Division II championships until it has been a voting member conference for at least two consecutive academic years. The immediate effective date will allow for the development of potential new conferences during the 2008 calendar year.

NO. 2 (NO. 2-3) NCAA MEMBERSHIP — MEMBER CONFERENCE — ELIGIBILITY — CONFERENCE WITH FEWER THAN SIX ACTIVE MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Intent: To establish a process for a conference with fewer than six active member institutions desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges, as follows: (1) Require submission of an application to the Membership Committee not later than December 1; (2) Require submission of information at the time of application, including a conference strategic plan, a conference constitution and bylaws, documentation affirming the conference satisfies the sports sponsorship requirement, a business plan for conference office operations, and a student-athlete advisory committee development plan; and (3) Require the conference to complete an educational assessment program within the year immediately following submission of the application, as specified.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.3, as follows:

3.3 MEMBER CONFERENCE.

3.3.1 Eligibility.

[3.3.1.1 through 3.3.1.2 unchanged.]

3.3.1.3 Provisional Membership Requirement Conference with Fewer Than Six Active Member Institutions. A newly formed conference with fewer than six active member institutions desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges must complete a provisional membership period prior to becoming eligible for election meet the following conditions:

(a) Submit an application to the Membership Committee, to be received in the national office not later than December 1. The following information must be submitted at the time of application:

- (1) A conference strategic plan;
- (2) A conference constitution and bylaws;
- (3) Documentation affirming the conference satisfies the sports sponsorship requirement;
- (4) A business plan for conference office operations; and
- (5) A student-athlete advisory committee development plan.

Once the application is approved by the Membership Committee and the conference has at least six active member institutions, a conference with fewer than six active member institutions shall be eligible for privileges of active member conferences, except for automatic qualification (see Bylaws 31.3.4.3 and 31.3.4.5).

(b) A The conference that forms with six or more active members must complete a two-year provisional membership period. an educational assessment program within the year immediately following submission of the application, as outlined below:

- (1) Attendance by the conference commissioner at the NCAA Convention;
- (2) Visit to an active member conference office or meeting;
- (3) Attendance by the conference commissioner at an NCAA national office visit;
- (4) Attendance by the conference commissioner at the NCAA Regional Rules Compliance Seminar;
- (5) Visit by Membership Committee representatives to the conference office; and
- (6) Annually submit a conference progress report.

A conference that forms with fewer than six active members must complete a four-year provisional membership period.

In the event that more than one year is needed to increase the conference membership to at least six active member institutions or to complete the educational assessment program, the conference must repeat all of the conditions of the educa-

tional assessment program, except for the visit to an active member conference's office or meeting and a visit by Membership Committee representatives to the conference office.

B. Constitution: Amend 3.3.7, as follows:

3.3.7 Provisional Conference with Fewer Than Six Active Member Institutions — Membership Requirements. A conference desiring to become a voting conference member must satisfy the *provisional* membership requirement set forth in Constitution 3.3.1.3 and the requirements set forth in the following provisions.

3.3.7.1 Types of Conferences. *Provisional conference* **Conference** membership is available to conferences that consist of a *minimum of six* four-year colleges or universities or two-year upper-level collegiate institutions that are currently active or provisional members (see Constitution 3.3.1.2) of Division II and accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency.

3.3.7.2 **Provisional Membership** Period. A newly formed conference desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges must complete a *provisional membership period* prior to becoming eligible for election **the requirements in Constitution 3.3.1.3.** *A conference that forms with six or more active members must complete a two-year provisional membership period. A conference that forms with fewer than six active members must complete a four-year provisional membership period.*

3.3.7.2.1 *Credit for Previous Conference Membership.* The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant credit to a conference for any portion of the first two years of the required provisional membership period (i.e., two-year or four-year requirement) or components of the requirements of such years, provided the conference had previously been a voting conference member within the past 10 years.

3.3.7.3 *Transfer of Provisional Conference Membership from Division I or III.* The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive a maximum of one year of the provisional conference membership period if a conference transfers its conference membership from Division I or III, provided the conference has been a member of the previous division for at least one year.

3.3.7.4 *Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement.* A provisional member conference shall conduct conference competition in at least five sports for men, with at least one in each season and five sports for women, with at least one in each sea-

son. *For a sport to count as one of the five for men or one of the five for women, the following criteria must be satisfied:*

- (a) *The conference must conduct a conference championship (e.g., round robin or tournament play) and name a conference champion in the sport;*
- (b) *In team sports only, the conference must conduct regular-season competition among the conference members sponsoring the sport; and*
- (c) *At least six conference member institutions must sponsor and compete in the sport.*

3.3.7.4.1 *Waiver.* The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the requirements of Constitution 3.3.7.4 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action.

3.3.7.5 Privileges and Voting Rights.

3.3.7.5.1 *Convention Representation and Association Mailings.* Provisional member conferences shall be entitled to be represented by one nonvoting delegate at any Convention of the Association and shall receive all publications and mailings received by voting member conferences.

3.3.7.5.2 *Use of Association's Registered Marks.* A provisional member may use the registered marks of the Association (i.e., the Association's name, logo or other insignia) only in accordance with guidelines established by the Executive Committee.

3.3.7.6 Election Procedures.

3.3.7.6.1 *Application.* A conference desiring to become a provisional member conference shall apply on or before June 1 on a form available from the national office. A nonrefundable application fee shall accompany the application. The amount of the fee will be determined annually by the Management Council based on an analysis of expenses associated with the provisional member educational assessment program. In addition, a check for annual dues also shall accompany the application.

3.3.7.6.2 *Election.* A favorable vote by two-thirds majority of the Management Council member present and voting shall elect the conference to provisional membership effective the following September 1.

3.3.7.7 Conditions and Obligations of Membership.

3.3.7.7.1 *General Rules-Compliance Requirements.* A conference that has a two-year provisional membership requirement shall operate in accordance with all legislative requirements during both years of provisional membership. A conference that has a four-year provi-

sional requirement shall apply the legislation to the greatest extent possible in years one and two, except for minimum sport-sponsorship requirements set forth in Constitution 3.3.2.2.3. Such a conference must satisfy the requirements set forth in Constitution 3.3.2.2.3 in years one and two. During years three and four, the conference shall operate in accordance with all legislative requirements of the division.

3.3.7.7.2 Annual Review of Progress. A provisional member conference shall provide, on an annual basis, a written report to be reviewed by the Membership Committee describing the conference's progress in meeting membership requirements. The report shall be post-marked not later than June 1 each year.

3.3.7.7.3 Educational Assessment Program. During the provisional membership period, a provisional member conference shall complete an educational assessment program regarding requirements for voting conference membership. Provisional member conferences are required to complete the following educational activities during the provisional member period:

(a) *Year One — Orientation*

- (1) *September — Receipt of notification of approval;*
- (2) *October — Conference commissioner and/or other conference officer(s) attend Division II Conference Commissioners Association's meeting;*
- (3) *January — Convention orientation session with NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioners Association and attendance at the Division II Business Session;*
- (4) *March — Conference commissioner and/or other conference officer(s) participate in visit to national office;*
- (5) *May/June — NCAA Regional Rules-Compliance Seminars; and*
- (6) *June 1 — Conference progress report due.*

(b) *Year Two — Rules and Compliance Awareness*

- (1) *October — Conference commissioner and/or other conference officer(s) attend Division II Conference Commissioners Association meeting;*
- (2) *January — Educational session at NCAA Convention with NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioner Association and attendance at the Division II Business Session;*

- (3) *April — Conference office visit by NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioners Association;*
- (4) *May/June — NCAA Regional Rules-Compliance Seminar; and*
- (5) *June 1 — Conference progress report due.*

(c) *Year Three — Self Assessment*

- (1) *September — Rules-compliance orientation meeting for conference commissioner and other conference officer(s) at NCAA national office;*
- (2) *October — Conference commissioner and/or other conference officer(s) attend Division II Conference Commissioners Association meeting;*
- (3) *January — Educational session at NCAA Convention with NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioners Association and attendance at the Division II Business Session;*
- (4) *May/June — NCAA Regional Rules-Compliance Seminar; and*
- (5) *June 1 — Conference progress report due.*

(d) *Year Four — Verification*

- (1) *October — Conference commissioner and/or other conference officer(s) attend Division II Conference Commissioners Association meeting;*
- (2) *January — Educational session at NCAA Convention with NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioners Association and attendance at the Division II Business Session;*
- (3) *April/May — Conference office visit by NCAA staff and Membership Committee representative and/or representatives of Conference Commissioners Association;*
- (4) *May/June — NCAA Regional Rules-Compliance Seminar; and*
- (5) *June 1 — Conference final progress report due.*

3.3.7.7.3.1 Application of Provisional Membership Period. A conference applying for provisional conference membership with fewer than six active members must complete the requirements set forth for all four years. A conference applying with six or more active members must only complete requirements set forth in years three and four.

3.3.7.8.4 Determination of Provisional Membership Standing.

3.3.7.8.4.1 Failure to Meet Provisional Membership Requirements. A provisional conference member failing to meet and maintain the conditions set forth in Constitution 3.3.7 may be required to repeat a year of provisional conference membership (with or without conditions), placed in corresponding membership or have its membership terminated, by a two-thirds vote of the Membership Committee members present and voting. A notice of intention to terminate membership, stating the grounds on which such an action will be based, shall be given in writing to the president or chancellor of the provisional member conference.

3.3.7.8.4.1.1 Repeat of Provisional Membership. The Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting, may require a provisional conference member to repeat any one of the years of the provisional membership period. A conference may repeat a year only one time during the provisional membership period.

3.3.7.8.4.1.2 Waiver. An institution may appeal to the Membership Committee for a waiver of the provisional member educational assessment program requirements (see Constitution 3.3.7.7.3) based on a failure to meet the requirements due to circumstances beyond the control of the conference. Such an appeal must be filed before June 1 after the academic year in which the conference failed to fulfill the requirements.

3.3.7.8.4.1.3 Membership Committee Jurisdiction. Decisions made by the Membership Committee in regard to a conference's standing as provisional member are final.

3.3.7.8.4.1.3.1 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council shall hear and act on a conference's appeal of a decision made by the Membership Committee in regard to a conference's standing as a provisional member.

3.3.7.8.4.2 Reinstatement of Terminated Member. Any provisional member conference whose membership is terminated may reapply for membership after a period of one year.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Newly formed conferences that consist of less than six active member institutions must demonstrate their long-term stability and viability before being considered an active conference. Such conferences will be required to submit information that illustrates the planning and development of the conference. In addition, requiring a newly formed conference to submit an application by December 1 will allow the conference to begin its educational assessment program in the following year. Finally, a newly formed conference with less than six active member institutions will attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges on approval of the application by the Membership Committee and the conference has at least six active member institutions. However, the conference shall not attain an automatic qualification for Division II championships until it has been a voting member conference for at least two consecutive academic years and it has at least six members that sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis. The immediate effective date will allow for the development of potential new conferences during the 2008 calendar year.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 3 (NO. 2-1) NCAA MEMBERSHIP — ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP — CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM**

Intent: To establish a pilot program to allow Canadian institutions to join the Division II membership.

Constitution: Amend 3.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

3.1 Eligibility for Membership.

3.1.1 General. Membership is available to colleges, universities, athletics conferences or associations and other groups that are related to intercollegiate athletics; that have acceptable academic standards (as defined in Constitution 3.2.3.3), and that are located in **Canada and** the United States, its territories or possessions. Such institutions or organizations must accept and observe the principles set forth in the constitution and bylaws of the Association.

3.1.1.1 Membership of Canadian Institutions — Pilot Program. Canadian institutions invited to enter a pilot program to explore Division II membership must accept or observe the pilot program's policies and procedures as developed and approved by the Executive Committee, in addition to the principles set forth in the constitution and bylaws of the Association.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This pilot program will allow the Membership Committee to study the feasibility of Canadian institutions joining the Division II membership. It could also potentially help to increase the number of active Division II institutions. It would also allow Division II to examine the issues involved with international membership and to assess the viability of Canadian institutions becoming active members in the Association. The pilot program would also allow the governance structure to properly address any potential logistical challenges that are inherent in competing outside the United States. The proposed effective date for this amendment is immediate to permit Canadian institutions to meet the application deadline of June 1 to enter into the membership process during the 2008-09 academic year.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-5) RECRUITING — PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS FOLLOWING NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT SIGNING OR OTHER WRITTEN COMMITMENT**

Intent: To specify that electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent to a prospective student-athlete is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles; further, to specify that after the calendar day on which a prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent (NLI), the institution with which the prospective student-athlete has signed shall be permitted to send other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., instant messaging, text messaging) in addition to electronic mail and facsimiles, and that for an institution not using the NLI in a particular sport, or for a prospective student-athlete who is not eligible to sign the NLI, the institution shall be permitted to send other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence in addition to electronic mail and facsimiles after the calendar day on which the prospective student-athlete signs the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.12, as follows:
[Roll Call]

13.02.12 Telephone Calls. *Facsimiles and other* **All** electronically transmitted *correspondence* **human voice exchange (including videoconferencing and videophones)** shall *not* be considered telephone calls. **Any other form of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail, facsimiles) shall not be considered telephone calls (see Bylaw 13.4).**

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4, as follows:
[Roll Call]

13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS.

[13.4.1 through 13.4.4 unchanged.]

13.4.5 Electronic Transmissions. **Electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent to a prospective student-athlete is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles. All other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., instant messaging, text messaging) are prohibited. Color attachments may be included with electronic mail correspondence sent to a prospective student-athlete, provided the attachment does not include any animation, audio or video clips and there is no cost (e.g., subscription fee) associated with sending the item attached to the electronic mail correspondence.**

13.4.5.1 Electronic Transmissions Following National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment. **After the calendar day on which a prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent, the institution with which the prospective student-athlete has signed shall be permitted to send other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., instant messaging, text messaging) in addition to electronic mail and facsimiles to the prospective student-athlete. For an institution not using the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport, or for a prospective student-athlete who is not eligible to sign a National Letter of Intent (e.g., four-year college transfer), the institution shall be permitted to send other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence in addition to electronic mail and facsimiles after the calendar day on which the prospective student-athlete signs the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: The unlimited use of certain forms of electronic communication, such as instant and text messaging, to contact prospective student-athletes has become problematic. Coaches feel compelled to contact prospective student-athletes constantly, prospective student-athletes are distracted all hours of the day and night, and prospective student-athletes and their parents are bearing the significant costs involved with receiving text messages. In addition, instant and text messaging further

removes the parents and high school coaches from the recruiting process. Prohibiting institutions from sending these intrusive and impersonal forms of electronic communication to prospective student-athletes and returning to the use of weekly telephone conversations, electronic mail sent to computers and written correspondence will reduce the burdens that have been created with the overuse of text messaging sent to cell phones and other portable electronic communication devices. This proposal would also establish an exception that would be similar to the current exception regarding unlimited telephone calls after a written commitment. This would allow institutions to use instant messaging and text messaging after the signing of the National Letter of Intent or other written commitment for the day-to-day aspects of pre-enrollment activities while still maintaining the integrity of the recruiting process (e.g., sending a text message reminder to a signed prospective student-athlete that an admissions application is due, sending a message that the NCAA Eligibility Center is missing test scores).

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-12) ELIGIBILITY — FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT — REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE OR COMPETITION — ELIGIBILITY FOR MALE STUDENTS OR MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES TO PRACTICE WITH WOMEN'S TEAMS — CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that a male student who practices with an institution's women's team must be certified in accordance with all applicable NCAA eligibility regulations for practice and competition; further, to specify that a male student-athlete in any sport may engage in practice sessions with an institution's women's team.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.8.1.7, as follows:

[Roll Call]

14.1.8.1.7 Eligibility for Male Students **or Male Student-Athletes** to Practice with Women's Teams. *It is permissible for A male students or a male student-athlete (see Bylaw 17.02.9) to may* engage in practice sessions with women's teams under the following conditions:

- (a) *Male students who practice with an institution's women's team on an occasional basis must be verified as eligible for practice in accordance with Bylaw 14.1.8.1 and must have eligibility remaining under the 10-semester/15-quarter rule (see Bylaw 14.2.2).*
- (b) Male students who practice with an institution's women's team *on a regular basis* must be certified in accordance with all applicable NCAA eligibility regulations **for practice and competition** (e.g., *must be* enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies, *must* sign a drug-testing

consent form, *must be* included on the institution's squad list, **certify insurance coverage for medical expenses per Constitution 3.2.4.9).**

- (c) *An institution must certify insurance coverage for medical expenses resulting from athletically related injuries sustained as a direct result of participation in a covered event for male students who practice with an institution's women's team (see Constitution 3.2.4.9).*

- (db) It is not permissible for an institution to provide male students financial assistance, which includes room and board, tuition and fees, and books, in return for practicing with the women's team. *A male student who is receiving financial aid or any compensation for serving in any position in the athletics department may not practice with a women's team. A male student-athlete who is receiving athletically related financial aid in any sport may not engage in practice sessions with an institution's women's basketball, volleyball or field hockey team on a regular basis.*

- (c) **It is not permissible for an institution to provide male students awards and benefits set forth in Bylaw 16.**

[14.1.8.1.7-(e) through 14.1.8.1.7-(g) relettered as 14.1.8.1.7-(d) through 14.1.8.1.7-(f), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

[17.02.1 through 17.02.8 unchanged.]

17.02.9 Male Student-Athletes Practicing with Women's Teams. **A male student-athlete who engages in practice activities with a women's team is subject to all applicable playing and practice seasons regulations set forth in this section (e.g., daily and weekly hour limitations, required days off).**

[17.02.9 through 17.02.14 renumbered as 17.02.10 through 17.02.15, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Currently, there are two standards in place for certification of male practice players depending on whether they are used on an occasional or a regular basis. This has caused some confusion in the membership regarding the certification of male students who practice with an institution's women's team. This recommended change would establish one standard for certifying male students who practice with an institution's women's team, regardless if such males participate on an occasional or regular basis. In addition, it should be left to the discretion of

institutions that use male practice players to determine if they use male students or male student-athletes in that capacity. All Bylaw 17 regulations (e.g., maximum of 20 hours per week during the playing season, maximum of eight hours per week outside the playing season, required days off during the playing season and outside the playing season) would continue to apply if a male student-athlete practices with an institution's women's team.

***NO. 5-1 ELIGIBILITY — FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT — REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE OR COMPETITION — ELIGIBILITY FOR MALE STUDENTS OR MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES TO PRACTICE WITH WOMEN'S TEAMS — CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To amend 2008 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 5 to eliminate the requirement that a male student who practices with an institution's women's team must be certified in accordance with all applicable NCAA eligibility regulations for competition.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 5, Part A, Bylaw 14.1.8.1.7, as follows:
[Roll Call]

14.1.8.1.7 Eligibility for Male Students or Male Student-Athletes to Practice with Women's Teams. A male student or a male student-athlete (see Bylaw 17.02.9) may engage in practice sessions with women's teams under the following conditions:

- (a) Male students who practice with an institution's women's team must be certified in accordance with all applicable NCAA eligibility regulations for practice *and competition* (e.g., enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies, sign a drug-testing consent form, included on the institution's squad list, certify insurance coverage for medical expenses per Constitution 3.2.4.9).

[14.1.8.1.7-(b) through 14.1.8.1.7-(f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council).

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: In reviewing the original amendment, it was noted that male practice players should be held to the same certification requirements as the female student-athletes on a women's team. Female student-athletes who only practice with the team are required to be certified for practice, but they are not required to be certified for competition (e.g., progress-toward-degree requirements). Therefore, a male student who practices with a women's team also should only be required to be certified in accordance with all applicable regulations for practice because he will not participate in outside competition.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-14) ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS — ELIGIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL AID, PRACTICE AND COMPETITION — QUALIFIER — EXCEPTION — EARLY ACADEMIC CERTIFICATION**

Intent: To specify that a prospective student-athlete shall be certified as a qualifier, provided he or she has achieved (a) A minimum combined score on the SAT critical reading and math sections of 1000 or a minimum sum score on the ACT of 85, per the requirements of Bylaw 14.3.1.3; and (b) A core-course grade-point average of 3.000 or higher (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a minimum of 12 core courses on completion of six semesters (or the equivalent), including three core courses in English, two in mathematics, two in natural or physical science and five additional core courses in any NCAA core area.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

14.3.1.1 Qualifier. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who presented the following minimum academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) through 14.3.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

14.3.1.1.1 Exception — Early Academic Certification. A prospective student-athlete shall be certified as a qualifier, provided he or she has achieved the following academic criteria:

- (a) A minimum combined score on the SAT critical reading and math sections of 1000 or a minimum sum score on the ACT of 85, per the requirements of Bylaw 14.3.1.3; and
- (b) A core-course grade-point average of 3.000 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a minimum of 12 core courses on completion of six semesters (or the equivalent). The 12 core courses shall include three core courses in English, two in mathematics (at the level of Algebra I or higher), two in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course if offered at the high school) and five additional core courses in any NCAA core area. The record of the course and course grades must be certified by the NCAA Eligibility Center using either an official high school transcript forwarded directly from the high school or a high school transcript forwarded by an institution's admissions office.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate, for those students first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2008.

Rationale: Colleges and universities frequently admit students after receipt of a six-semester high school transcript and standardized test score. NCAA initial-eligibility rules currently make no similar provision for an “early qualifier” status. The requirement of an eight-semester transcript for all students results in the vast majority of final certifications occurring during July and August, which results in significant volume in a short period of time. An early certification process in which a reasonable percentage of anticipated qualifiers would be certified as qualifiers after six semesters of high school will provide member institutions with earlier eligibility decisions, and alleviate some of the volume during the busy summer months. Based on data provided by the NCAA research staff, it is clear that prospective student-athletes who meet this standard would be deemed qualifiers after eight semesters. In addition, this proposal lessens the amount of bureaucracy involved in the initial-eligibility process. It is important to note that no waiver process is available for prospective student-athletes who do not meet the exception for early certification. Such prospective student-athletes will be evaluated subject to the standard requirements to be certified as a qualifier.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-15) ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS — CORE-COURSE UNITS**

Intent: To increase the total number of required core-course units for initial eligibility from 14 to 16; further, to specify that the two additional core-course units shall include one unit of additional courses in English, mathematics or natural or physical science and one unit in any core area.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

14.3.1.1 Qualifier. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who presented the following minimum academic qualifications:

(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least **14 16** academic courses per Bylaw 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 years
Mathematics	2 years
Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course if offered by the high school)	2 years

Additional courses in English, mathematics or natural or physical science	2 3 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or foreign language, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	3 4 years

The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified by the NCAA Eligibility Center using an official high school transcript forwarded directly from the high school or on a high school transcript forwarded by an institution’s admissions office; and

[14.3.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.2.6, as follows:

[Roll Call]

14.3.1.2.6 Grade Value of Core Courses. The following grade values are to be used in determining a student’s grade-point average in the core courses: A = 4 quality points, B = 3 quality points, C = 2 quality points, D = 1 quality point. In determining the core-curriculum grade-point average, each grade earned in a course (including all numerical grades) must be converted to this 4.000 scale on an individual-course basis. Pluses or minuses within a grade level shall not receive greater or lesser quality points. A school’s normal practice of weighting honors or advanced courses may be used to compute the quality points awarded in those courses and the cumulative grade-point average, provided a written statement verifying the grading policy accompanies the prospective student-athlete’s official grade transcript. An honors or an advanced course shall receive no greater than 1.000 additional quality point (e.g., A = 5.000). In calculating the grade in a weighted honors or advanced course, if a high school does not assign quality points to its courses, quality points shall be added to each course before calculating the student’s grade-point average and not added to a student’s cumulative core-course grade-point average. The core-curriculum grade-point average may be calculated using the student’s **14 16** best grades from courses that meet the distribution requirements of the core curriculum. Additional core courses (beyond the **14 16** required) may be used to meet the core-curriculum grade-point average, provided the distribution requirements are met.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2013; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2013.

Rationale: Current research data indicates that the Division II core-course requirements are lower than the majority of high school graduation requirements across the United States and the admission criteria for enrollment at Division II institutions. An increase

in the number of core courses from 14 to 16 better aligns Division II initial-eligibility standards with the current high school standards for graduation and the current Division II admissions criteria. Exposure to core academic classes results in students better prepared to take the SAT or ACT and better prepared for the demands of college coursework. This recommendation to increase core-course requirements would enhance the academic success of student-athletes at both the collegiate and high school levels. The recommendation requires an additional unit of courses in either English, mathematics or natural or physical science and one unit in any core area. This provides flexibility in core-course selection. This increase would be effective five years from the adoption date in order to provide ample notice to the membership and secondary-school population. If adopted, this legislation would raise the core-course requirement as follows: English 3; Math 2; Natural/Physical Science 2; English, Math or Natural/Physical Science 3; Social Science 2; and, Additional/Any core area 4; for a total of 16.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-17) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — SKILL INSTRUCTION — SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL — VENUE AND SIZE OF GROUPS**

Intent: In sports other than football, to permit more than one group of student-athletes from the same team to participate in skill instruction with a coach outside the institution's declared playing season in the same facility or in different facilities at the same time, provided there is no co-mingling between the groups, and each group of student-athletes participates in skill instruction with a separate coach; further, to specify that no more than four student-athletes from the same individual sport shall be a part of a group of student-athletes working with a coach at one time, no more than four student-athletes from the same team in team sports with a starting squad size of six or fewer shall be a part of a group working with a coach at one time, and no more than six student-athletes from the same team in team sports with a starting squad size of seven or more shall be a part of a group of student-athletes working with a coach at one time.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6.2.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.1.6.2.1 Skill Instruction. In sports other than football, participation by student-athletes in individual skill-related instruction is permitted outside the institution's declared playing season, *provided no more than four student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coach(es) at any one time in any facility.* **More than one group of student-athletes from the same team may participate in skill instruction with their coach(es) in the same facility or in different facilities at the same time, provided there is no co-mingling**

between the groups. Each group of student-athletes must have a separate coach.

17.1.6.2.1.1 Groups of Student-Athletes. In sports other than football, the following number of student-athletes is permitted in each group for skill instruction.

- (a) **Individual Sports.** No more than four student-athletes from the same individual sport shall be a part of a group of student-athletes working with a coach at one time.
- (b) **Team Sports with Starting Squad Size of Six or Fewer.** No more than four student-athletes from the same team shall be a part of a group of student-athletes working with a coach at one time.
- (c) **Team Sports with Starting Squad Size of Seven or More.** No more than six student-athletes from the same team shall be a part of a group of student-athletes working with a coach at one time.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: This will permit two or more groups of student-athletes from the same team to participate in individual skill instruction with their coaches outside of the declared playing season at the same time, in the same or different locations, provided there is no co-mingling between the groups. In addition, each group of student-athletes must have a separate coach. The proposal also amends the number of student-athletes in the group depending on whether they participate in individual or team sports. This change benefits student-athlete well-being by providing more opportunities to participate in skill instruction during regular school hours, while at the same time, reducing some of the administrative burdens placed on institutional facilities and resources. Moreover, this addresses student-athlete time demands by allowing team sports with larger starting squad sizes to include more student-athletes in a group.

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-21) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT — STRATEGIC POSITIONING PLATFORM**

Intent: To revise the Division II philosophy statement, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10, as follows:

[Roll Call]

20.10 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

In addition to the purposes and fundamental policy of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, as set forth in Constitution 1, members of Division II believe that a well-conducted in-

tercollegiate athletics program, based on sound educational principles and practices, is a proper part of the educational mission of a university or college and that the educational *welfare well-being and academic success* of the participating student-athlete is of primary concern.

Higher education has lasting importance on an individual's future success. For this reason, the positioning statement for the division and the emphasis for the student-athlete experience in Division II is a comprehensive program of learning and development in a personal setting. The Division II approach provides growth opportunities through academic achievement, learning in high-level athletics competition and development of positive societal attitudes in service to community. The balance and integration of these different areas of learning provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead.

Members support the following *principles attributes* in the belief that these *objectives attributes* assist in defining the division's *priorities* and **emphasize the division's position within the possible differences between it and other divisions of the Association: Learning; Service; Passion; Sportsmanship; Resourcefulness; and Balance.** *This statement The positioning statement and the attributes shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs, initiatives and policies by member institutions, and conferences and the Division II governance structure.*

Furthermore, a member of Division II believes in a set of common features, which assist in defining the division. Such features include exceptional teacher-to-student ratios that provide student-athletes with a quality education, a unique model of staffing in which coaches provide additional services such as teaching and mentoring, and the development of community partnerships and student-athlete participation in community engagement activities. A member of Division II also believes in the following principles, which assist in defining the division:

- (a) *Believes in p*Promoting the academic success of its student-athletes, measured in part by an institution's student-athletes graduating at least at the same rate as the institution's student body;
- (b) *Believes t*That participation in intercollegiate athletics benefits the educational experience of its student-athletes and the entire campus community;
- (c) *Believes in o*Offering opportunities for intercollegiate athletics participation consistent with the institution's mission and philosophy;

- (d) *Believes That* championships are intended to provide national-level competition among eligible student-athletes and teams of members institutions;
- (e) *Believes in p*Preparing student-athletes to be good citizens, leaders and contributors in their communities;
- (f) *Believes in s*Striving for equitable participation and competitive excellence, encouraging sportsmanship and ethical conduct, enhancing diversity and developing positive societal attitudes in all of its athletics endeavors;
- (g) *Believes in s*Scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographical location and traditional or conference scheduling patterns permit;
- (h) *Recognizes Recognizing* the need to "balance" the role of the athletics program to serve both the *campus institution* (e.g., participants, student body, faculty-staff) and the general public (e.g., community, area, state);
- (i) *Believes in o*Offering an opportunity for participation in intercollegiate athletics by awarding athletically related financial aid to its student-athletes;
- (j) *Believes t*That institutional control is a fundamental principle that supports the educational mission of a Division II institution and assumes presidential involvement and commitment. All funds supporting athletics should be controlled by the institution. The emphasis for an athletics department should be to operate within an institutionally approved budget and compliance with and self enforcement of NCAA regulations is an expectation of membership; and
- (k) *Believes t*That all members of Division II should commit themselves to this philosophy and to the regulations and programs of Division II.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Following the Division II Chancellors and Presidents Summit in June 2005, the NCAA Division II Presidents Council implemented a study related to the division's defining characteristics and key attributes. Thereafter, the Division II Strategic Positioning Platform was developed through data-driven research. The platform defines the division, and outlines its fundamental beliefs. The proposed changes will help to ensure consistency with the philosophy statement and the positioning platform. These changes will also serve as notice to the membership that the platform will serve as a guide for preparing legislation and planning and implementing programs for the division in the future.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-22) ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS —
ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE
DISCLOSURE — ACADEMIC
PERFORMANCE CENSUS DISCLOSURE**

Intent: To specify that an institution shall forfeit Division II enhancement funds for the following academic year unless it has submitted, by the applicable deadline, its Academic Performance Census (APC) in a form approved and administered by the Presidents Council, or an entity designated by the Presidents Council.

Administrative: Amend 30.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

30.1 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE. An institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or an individual competitor in an NCAA championship unless it has completed and submitted a copy of the Integrated Postsecondary-Education Data System Graduation-Rate Survey (IPEDS GRS-1) to the NCAA national office on or before the applicable deadline established by federal regulations. (See Bylaw 13.3 for additional regulations.)

30.1.1 Academic Performance Census — Failure to Submit. If an institution fails to submit its Academic Performance Census by the applicable deadline, in a format approved and administered by the Presidents Council (or a committee designated by the Presidents Council), that institution shall forfeit Division II institutional enhancement funds for the following academic year.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008; however, institutions will be required to submit data from the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years during the first year of disclosure.

Rationale: This recommended change will allow for the collection of APC information. APC data provides vital information used by the Division II membership to study student-athletes' academic performance, determine academic eligibility rules and consider the impact of various academic policies by gender, sport or ethnicity. The data represents the most important academic information collected by the Association, and is required to understand the effects of academic eligibility legislation. APC data may be submitted through the Academic Tracking System, which is the same system for reporting the institution's Academic Success Rate. The effective date of the proposed change is August 1, 2008; however, institutions will be required to submit data from the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years during the first year of disclosure. In addition, the penalty will be effective during the first year of required disclosure.

RECRUITING

**NO. 11 (NO. 2-6) RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND
FINANCIAL AID — PERMISSION TO
CONTACT, TRANSFER RELEASE AND
FINANCIAL AID HEARING — NOTICE
OF INSTITUTIONAL DENIAL OF
STUDENT-ATHLETE REQUEST**

Intent: To specify that notification of an institution's decision to deny a student-athlete's request to permit another institution to contact the student-athlete about transferring, notification of the institution's decision to deny the student-athlete's request for release as a condition of the one-time transfer exception and notification to a student-athlete in regard to the opportunity for a hearing when his or her athletics aid is reduced or cancelled during the period of the award or is reduced or nonrenewed for the following academic year, must be provided to the student-athlete, in writing, within 14 consecutive calendar days from receipt of a student-athlete's written request or the decision to reduce or cancel aid during the period of the award or the reduction or nonrenewal of aid for the following academic year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.2.1, as follows:

13.1.1.2.1 Hearing Opportunity. If the institution decides to deny a student-athlete's request to permit any other institution to contact the student-athlete about transferring, the *institution athletics director (or his or her designee)* shall inform the student-athlete in writing, **within 14 consecutive calendar days from receipt of a student-athlete's written request**, that he or she, on request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students; or a committee composed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing. The institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing.

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.10, as follows:

14.5.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution, and all of the following conditions are met (for graduate students, see Bylaw 14.1.9.1):

[14.5.5.3.10-(a) through 14.5.5.3.10-(b) unchanged.]

(c) The student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student being granted an exception to

the transfer residence requirement. If the student's previous institution denies his or her request for the release, the *institution athletics director (or his or her designee)* shall inform the student-athlete in writing, **within 14 consecutive calendar days from receipt of a student-athlete's written request**, that he or she, on request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students; or a committee composed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing. The institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing.

[14.5.5.3.10-(d) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.3.2.4, as follows:

15.3.2.4 Hearing Opportunity. The institution's regular financial aid authority shall notify the student-athlete in writing, **within 14 consecutive calendar days from the date the student-athlete has been notified of the decision to reduce or cancel aid during the period of the award or the reduction or nonrenewal of aid for the following academic year**, of the opportunity for a hearing when institutional financial aid based in any degree on athletics ability is reduced or canceled during the period of the award, or not renewed. The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's established policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request the hearing. The institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing and shall not delegate the responsibility for conducting the hearing to the university's athletics department or its faculty athletics committee.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Current legislation does not specify the time period during which an institution must respond to a student-athlete's request to contact another institution about transferring, request for release as a condition of the one-time transfer exception and notification to a student-athlete in regard to the opportunity for a hearing when his or her athletics aid is reduced or cancelled during the period of award or the aid is reduced or not renewed for the following academic year. A delay in an institution's decision in any of these situations may be detrimental to a student-athlete's well-being, and may put the student-athlete at a disadvantage

when seeking other opportunities at another institution. The 14-consecutive calendar day period will provide institutions with time to review a student-athlete's request and provide written notification to a student-athlete about its decision. The 14-consecutive calendar day period is consistent with other restrictions in the NCAA Division II Manual.

NO. 12 (NO. 2-7) ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA AND BANNED DRUG LIST — INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS — NOTIFICATION TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To require an institution to provide information regarding the Division II initial-eligibility standards to all recruited high school prospective student-athletes at the earliest practical time, but not later than the day prior to the student-athlete signing a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission and/or financial aid; further, to specify that a violation of this provision is an institutional violation, but does not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3, as follows:

14.3 FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS.

[14.3.1 through 14.3.5 unchanged.]

14.3.6 Notification of Initial-Eligibility Standards. Member institutions shall provide to high school prospective student-athletes and their parents or legal guardians information regarding the initial-eligibility standards contained in Bylaw 14.3. The information shall be provided at the earliest practical opportunity after the institution begins recruiting the prospective student-athlete, but not later than the day prior to the student-athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. An institution may provide the information in hard-copy or electronic form (e.g., electronic mail, link to Web site). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: There has been an increase in the use of misadvisement, misinformation or lack of information as mitigating circumstances in initial-eligibility waivers. Some institutions site misadvisement as a mitigating circumstance in multiple waiver requests.

This proposal seeks to reduce the instances of lack of information or misadvisement in initial-eligibility waivers by requiring institutions to inform high school prospective student-athletes of the initial-eligibility requirements at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process. This recommendation makes sound academic sense because it requires institutions to provide the information early in the recruiting process. Additionally, this proposal is consistent with other legislation that requires the institution to provide prospective student-athletes with graduation-rate data and NCAA banned drug list information.

NO. 13 (NO. 2-8) RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — VIDEO/AUDIO MATERIALS

Intent: To specify that an institution may not provide athletically related video/audio (e.g., highlight film, videotape, audiotape) materials to a prospective student-athlete until September 1 at the beginning of the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school, except video/audio materials regarding an institution's community engagement activities may be provided to a prospect at any time; further, to specify that violations of this rule are considered institutional violations and do not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.2, as follows:

13.4.2 Video/Audio Materials. An institution may not *produce provide athletically related* video/audio materials to *show or send* to a prospective student-athlete *except as specified in Bylaw 13.4.2.1, 13.4.2.2 and 13.4.2.3* **until September 1 at the beginning of the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school.** Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

13.4.2.1 *Highlight Film/Videotape/Audio Tape.* An institution may show a highlight film/videotape/audio tape to a prospective student-athlete or the prospective student-athlete's coach but may not send it to or leave it with the prospective student-athlete or coach. Highlight films/videotapes/audio tapes are "game clips" that contain informational material that is related to a particular event or sports season. Any narration on the highlight film/videotape/audio tape must relate specifically to the event or sports season.

13.4.2.2 *Videotapes/Audio Tapes (Nonathletics) Available to All Students.* Official academic admissions and student-services videotapes/audio tapes produced by the institution and available to all students may be provided to prospective student-athletes.

13.4.2.3 **Exception** — Community Engagement Activities. An institution may produce, show, send and provide a

prospective student-athlete with video/audio materials of its community engagement activities **at any time.**

13.4.2.4 *Electronic Information.* An institution may produce and show electronically stored information about the institution to a prospective student-athlete or the prospective student-athlete's coach but may not send it or leave it with the prospective student-athlete or coach. Information may include still photos and printed text that is electronically stored and delivered and relates directly to a particular institution and city. Further, the printed text shall cover only information pertaining to the institution's student services, academic admissions, catalog and campus life in addition to basic information pertaining to the immediate town/city where the institution is located.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: The proposed change to deregulate video/audio materials is consistent with the deregulation of printed recruiting materials. At this time, it is not cost prohibitive for institutions to produce video/audio materials. The production of such video/audio materials will be determined by each institution's budget. This will allow for more creativity in developing athletically related video/audio materials. This is also an effort to ensure that the recruiting regulations regarding video/audio materials are keeping pace with the changing technology. This proposal has an immediate effective date so as to allow institutions the benefit of applying the rule as soon as possible.

NO. 14 (NO. 2-9) RECRUITING — RECRUITING MATERIALS — VIDEO/AUDIO MATERIALS — COMPUTER RECRUITING PRESENTATIONS

Intent: To permit an institution to produce a computer recruiting presentation to show a prospective student-athlete during any permissible contact.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.2, as follows:

13.4.2 Video/Audio Materials. An institution may not produce video/audio materials to show or send to a prospective student-athlete except as specified in *Bylaw 13.4.2.1, 13.4.2.2 and 13.4.2.3* **this section.** Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.2.1 through 13.4.2.4 unchanged.]

13.4.2.5 Computer Recruiting Presentations. An institution may produce a computer recruiting presentation (e.g., using presentation software) to show to a

prospective student-athlete during any permissible contact, and place the presentation on the institution's Web site. Such a presentation may not include any video/audio component (except as permitted in Bylaw 13.4.2.1) and may not be personalized to include a prospective student-athlete's name, picture or likeness. Such a presentation may not be created by an entity outside the institution.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: As early as 2000, the membership began to consider legislation concerning recruiting presentations created by presentation software. Since then, as a standard inclusion in computer software packages, the availability and use of presentation software has increased dramatically, and at little or no cost to institutions. Such technology has become so common that there is no longer a perceived recruiting advantage. Rather, the value lies with the institution's ability to produce concise presentations and eliminate the expense of printing materials. While such presentations may include still photos (e.g., institutional facilities, coaching staff members) and slide transitions already contained in the software program, other video/audio materials will continue to be restricted by the current legislation. Further, the creating of such presentations may not be outsourced, thus eliminating additional cost to the institution.

***NO. 15 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — MANDATORY MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS — TIMING OF MEDICAL EXAMINATION**

Intent: To specify that a medical examination must be administered within one year prior to a prospective student-athlete's and a student-athlete's participation in any tryout, practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities; further, to specify that an updated medical history must be administered within one year prior to a student-athlete's participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities for the applicable academic year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2.1, as follows:

[Roll Call]

13.11.2.1 Tryouts. A member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospective student-athlete only on its campus or at a site at which it normally conducts practice or competition and only under the following conditions (see Bylaw 17.02.12 for tryouts of currently enrolled students):

[13.11.2.1-(a) through 13.11.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

(c) Prior to participation in a tryout, a prospective student-athlete is required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician (e.g., family physician, team physician). The examination or evaluation must be administered within *six months one year* prior to participation in the tryout. The medical examination or evaluation may be conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician as a part of the tryout;

[13.11.2.1-(d) through 13.11.2.1-(g) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.12, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.02.12 Tryouts — Enrolled Student-Athlete. A member institution may conduct a tryout of a full-time student currently enrolled at the institution only on its campus or at a site at which the institution normally conducts practice or competition during the regular academic year. If such a tryout occurs outside of the declared playing and practice season, the following conditions apply:

[17.02.12-(a) through 17.02.12-(c) unchanged.]

(d) Prior to participation in a tryout, a student is required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician (e.g., family physician, team physician). The examination or evaluation must be administered within *six months one year* prior to participation in the tryout. The medical examination or evaluation may be conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician as a part of the tryout;

[17.02.12-(e) through 17.02.12-(h) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, Roll Call]

17.1.5 Mandatory Medical Examination. Prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities (or, in Division I, permissible voluntary summer conditioning in basketball and football or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception), student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility shall be required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician (e.g., family physician, team physician). The examination or evaluation must be administered within *six months one year* prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities. In following years, an updated history of the student-athlete's medical condition shall be administered by an institutional medical staff member (e.g., sports medicine staff, team physician) to determine if additional examinations (e.g., physical, cardiovascular, neurological) are required. The updated history must be administered within *six months one year* prior to the student-athlete's participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities for the applicable academic year.

Source: Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Sunshine State Conference and North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: At the 2007 NCAA Convention, the Division II membership adopted Proposal No. 23 (playing and practice seasons - preseason practice - mandatory medical examinations), which requires prospective student-athletes and student-athletes to undergo a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician prior to initial participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities. Per that legislation, the medical examination must be conducted within six months prior to participation in any tryout, practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities. This proposed change would extend the period of time in which the medical examination and updated medical history must be conducted prior to participation in such activities from a six-month period to one year. Prospective student-athletes, student-athletes and institutions will benefit from this change because it will provide more time to obtain the medical examination or an updated medical history.

Committee Position [Presidents Council, Management Council, Legislation Committee and Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports (CSMAS)]: The Councils and CSMAS agreed to oppose this proposal. The Councils and CSMAS noted a need for consistency of the rule in that Bylaw 17.1.5 (mandatory medical examinations) is a common provision. The Councils and CSMAS also noted that a medical examination should ideally be performed at least six weeks prior to the start of any physical activity; however, the six-month time period was adopted to allow institutions flexibility to accommodate a large number of student-athletes requiring a medical examination at any one time. The Councils and CSMAS further noted that the official and staff interpretations regarding tryouts of prospective student-athletes and mandatory medical exams provides flexibility to institutions while maintaining the integrity of the rule. The Legislation Committee agreed to take no position on this proposal.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 16 (NO. 2-11) ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM — 14-CONSECUTIVE DAY GRACE PERIOD

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is trying out for a team is not required to complete the NCAA Drug-Testing Consent Form for 14 consecutive days from the first date the student-athlete engages in countable athletically related activities or before the student-athlete participates in a competition, whichever occurs first.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.4, as follows:

14.1.4 Drug-Testing Consent Form.

[14.1.4.1 unchanged.]

14.1.4.2 Exception — 14-Consecutive Calendar Day Grace Period. A student-athlete who is trying out for a team is not required to complete the NCAA Drug-Testing Consent Form for 14-consecutive calendar days from the first date the student-athlete engages in countable athletically related activities or before the student-athlete participates in a competition, whichever occurs first.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Under current legislation, student-athletes trying out for an institution's athletics team must complete the Drug-Testing Consent Form prior to practice or competition, whichever comes first. In some circumstances, student-athletes only participate for a few days before either being cut from the team or quitting the team. The time and effort spent by the institution in having each student-athlete complete the form results in wasted effort. This proposal would eliminate extra paper work and the time required to complete forms until the student-athlete is actually added to the squad list.

NO. 17 (NO. 2-13) ELIGIBILITY — SEASON-OF-COMPETITION WAIVER — COMPETITION WHILE ELIGIBLE — DOCUMENTED COACH'S MISUNDERSTANDING

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition when, due to a coach's documented misunderstanding of the legislation, the student-athlete, while eligible, participated in competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.7.1.2, as follows:

14.2.7.1.2 Extenuating Circumstances. Extenuating circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following:

[14.2.7.1.2-(a) through 14.2.7.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

(d) The student-athlete participated in competition due to a coach's documented misunderstanding of the legislation.

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: This proposal is in response to the Association-wide emphasis on student-athlete well-being and in recognition of the

substantial detriment to the student-athlete in a situation in which he or she was following a coach's instruction, but the coach's instruction was based on a misunderstanding of legislation. Since a coach must verify that he or she misunderstood that entering the student-athlete into competition would trigger the use of the season, and because the proposed legislation only allows those student-athletes who have competed in nonregular-season competition to qualify for the waiver, the potential for coaches to use this circumstance in an abusive manner is negligible. This proposal purposefully excludes any reference to the timing of when the nonregular-season competition takes place since nonregular competition may occur at any point during a season and that restricting the timing of such competitions may unfairly benefit some sports and exclude others.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 18 (NO. 2-16) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — LIMITS ON COUNTABLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO AND DURING THE FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

Intent: To specify that all countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of the institution's final examinations.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6.2, as follows:

17.1.6.2 Weekly Hour Limitations — Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season during the academic year, only a student-athlete's participation in weight-training, conditioning, individual skill instruction and, in football, review of game film shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual skill workouts set forth in Bylaw 17.1.6.2.1 and, in football, review of game film. **All countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of the institution's final examinations.** A student-athlete may not participate in any countable athletically related activities outside the playing season during any institutional vacation period (e.g., summer, academic year).

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: This change prohibits activities during the week before and during final examinations outside the playing season to ensure that time is available for student-athletes to study. This is a student-athlete well-being issue that benefits the student-athlete and enhances his or her opportunity for academic success.

NO. 19 (NO. 2-18) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — PRESEASON PRACTICES — ON-COURT PRACTICE — START DATE

Intent: In basketball, to specify that a member institution shall not commence the first on-court practice prior to 7 p.m. on the Friday nearest October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.2.1, as follows:

17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions *before prior to 7 p.m. on the Friday nearest October 15.*

Source: Peach Belt Conference and Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Current legislation specifies that on-court preseason basketball practice may not begin before October 15. In years when October 15 does not fall on a weekend, institutions must conduct "midnight madness" practices, which are open to the public, during the week. Attendance is generally lower than if such events occurred on a weekend. In addition, this causes a safety concern. By moving the first opportunity to practice to 7 p.m. on the Friday nearest October 15, student-athletes, coaches, training staff, prospective student-athletes, students, and the general public could participate in a practice in the evening and return home at a more reasonable hour. Finally, this change is consistent with the Division II strategic positioning platform regarding community engagement initiatives.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Presidents Council and the committee agreed to oppose this proposal. The Presidents Council and the committee noted a need to preserve a consistent start date for preseason on-court basketball practice sessions to avoid confusion in the membership. The Presidents Council and the committee further noted that the proposed amendment is not aligned with the deregulation effort in the division since the 2000 NCAA Convention. The Management Council agreed to take no position on this proposal.

NO. 20 (NO. 2-19) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST

Intent: In basketball, to specify that a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition prior to the second Friday of November.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, as follows:

17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball *before* **prior to the second Friday of November 15**, except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1.

Source: Peach Belt Conference and Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Currently, an institution shall not play its first contest against outside competition before November 15, aside from the exceptions outlined in Bylaw 17.5.3.1. This proposal will establish a common starting date for regular-season contests that will allow institutions to play its first contest on a weekend night, which may increase attendance. In addition, permitting the first contest to begin on a Friday will provide for new opportunities with inter-conference play (e.g., conference challenge tournaments), opportunities to enter into a community engagement initiative in conjunction with the season-opening contest and reduce missed class time for student-athletes.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Presidents Council and the committee agreed to oppose this proposal. The Presidents Council and the committee noted a need to preserve a consistent start date for the first contest against outside competition in basketball to avoid confusion in the membership. The Presidents Council and the committee further noted that the proposed amendment is not aligned with the deregulation effort in the division since the 2000 NCAA Convention. The Management Council agreed to take no position on this proposal.

**NO. 21 (NO. 2-20) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST —
EXCEPTIONS — PRESEASON EVENTS —
TIP-OFF CLASSIC**

Intent: In basketball, to specify that the Division II Tip-Off Classic may be played beginning on the Friday immediately preceding November 1 in calendar years when November 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3.1, as follows:

17.5.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted before the first contest dates specified under Bylaw 17.5.3:

[17.5.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

(b) Preseason Events.

(1) The following basketball games may be played on or after November 1:

(1i) The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic; **and**

(2ii) Games in the Division II Tip-Off Classic; **and**

(3) One game against a foreign team in Canada.

(2) **Games in the Division II Tip-Off Classic may be played beginning on the Friday immediately preceding November 1 in calendar years when November 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.**

[17.5.3.1-(c) through 17.5.3.1-(d) unchanged.]

Source: Sunshine State Conference, California Collegiate Athletic Association, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Peach Belt Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Currently, Division II Tip-Off Classic contests may not begin until November 1. This proposed change would allow the games to be played beginning on the Friday immediately preceding November 1 in calendar years when November 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday. In calendar years when November 1 falls on a Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, it is likely that the first contest of the Division II Tip-Off Classic will not be scheduled to begin until the Friday following November 1. This will enable games to be scheduled beginning on Friday and conclude over the weekend, thereby reducing missed class time for student-athletes who participate in the event.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal. The Councils and committee noted that contests in the Tip-Off Classic are permitted to occur before the first contest date in basketball; thus, a change to begin such contests on a Friday makes sense because the event will conclude during a weekend. The Councils and committee further noted that the proposed change supports the philosophy of reducing missed class time for student-athletes who participate in the event.

Votes By Attendee

Page: 34
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

Attendee	Handset	Item	Yes	No	Abstain	Invalid
Abilene Christian University	0040047025	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Adams State College	0040040366	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Adelphi University	0040051833	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Alderson-Broadus College	0040053219	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
American International College	0040051754	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Anderson University (South Carolina)	0040051887	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Angelo State University	0040051829	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 35
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Angelo State University	0040051829	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Arkansas Tech University	0040051824	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Armstrong Atlantic State University	0040051830	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Ashland University	0040053411	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Assumption College	0040053071	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Augusta State University	0040053390	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Augustana College (South Dakota)	0040053163	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8			1	
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 36
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Barry University	0040016232	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Barton College	0040053374	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Belmont Abbey College	0040053228	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Bemidji State University	0040053441	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Benedict College	0040052083	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Bentley College	0040052074	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Bloomfield College	0040053752	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 37
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Bloomfield College	0040053752	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	0040054616	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Bluefield State College	0040053530	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1			1	
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Bowie State University	0040054455	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Brigham Young University (Hawaii)	0040054565	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	0040054506	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Caldwell College	0040054528	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 38
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
California Collegiate Athletic Association	0040053146	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
California State Polytechnic University (Pomona)	0040053650	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
California State University (Chico)	0040053519	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
California State University (Dominguez Hills)	0040053770	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
California State University (Los Angeles)	0040053839	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
California State University (Monterey Bay)	0040054434	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
California State University (Stanislaus)	0040053727	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 39
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
California State University (Stanislaus)	0040053727	Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
California University of Pennsylvania	0040053802	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Cameron University	0040052167	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10			1	
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Catawba College	0040054489	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference	0040053408	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	0040048026	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Central Washington University	0040053527	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 40
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Chadron State College	0040054439	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Chaminade University	0040053815	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Chowan University	0040054519	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Christian Brothers University	0040053720	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	0040053532	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Clark Atlanta University	0040053458	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Clayton State University	0040053773	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 41
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Clayton State University	0040053773	Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Coker College	0040052930	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
College of Saint Rose	0040053749	Proposal No. 3			1	
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Colorado School of Mines	0040052060	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Colorado State University-Pueblo	0040054503	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Columbus State University	0040052341	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Concord University	0040053766	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 42
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Concordia University (St. Paul)	0040053728	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5			1	
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			
Conference Carolinas	0040053402	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
Converse College	0040053522	Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
Dallas Baptist University	0040053701	Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
Davis and Elkins College	0040053513	Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
Delta State University	0040054559	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
Dominican College (New York)	0040054607	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 43
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Dominican College (New York)	0040054607	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Dowling College	0040052342	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Drury University	0040052387	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
East Central University	0040053840	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
East Coast Conference	0040051826	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	0040054545	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Eastern New Mexico University	0040054550	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 44
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Eckerd College	0040054579	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	0040052176	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Elizabeth City State University	0040054444	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Emporia State University	0040054443	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10			1	
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Fairmont State University	0040054445	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Fayetteville State University	0040053816	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Felician College	0040052191	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 45
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Felician College	0040052191	Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Ferris State University	0040052288	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Florida Institute of Technology	0040052119	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Florida Southern College	0040053508	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Fort Hays State University	0040052272	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Fort Lewis College	0040052102	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Fort Valley State University	0040054402	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 46
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Fort Valley State University	0040054402	Proposal 20		1		
Francis Marion University	0040053716	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Franklin Pierce University	0040053806	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15			1	
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Gannon University	0040053805	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Georgia College & State University	0040053776	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Georgian Court University	0040053845	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Glennville State College	0040054401	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Goldey-Beacom College	0040054400	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 47
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Goldey-Beacom College	0040054400	Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Grand Canyon University	0040052242	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Grand Valley State University	0040054536	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	0040014839	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Great Lakes Valley Conference	0040051794	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Great Northwest Athletic Conference	0040051819	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Gulf South Conference	0040061953	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Harding University	0040052215	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 48
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Harding University	0040052215	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Hawaii Pacific University	0040054485	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Henderson State University	0040053711	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Hillsdale College	0040053788	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Holy Family University	0040053710	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Proposal 20	1			
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	0040054518	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
Johnson C. Smith University	0040052321	Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 49
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Johnson C. Smith University	0040052321	Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Kentucky State University	0040054499	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Kentucky Wesleyan College	0040054562	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	0040053783	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lake Superior State University	0040052239	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lander University	0040053779	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Le Moyne College	0040052365	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5			1	
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Lees-McRae College	0040053778	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 50
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Lees-McRae College	0040053778	Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lenoir-Rhyne College	0040053763	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Lewis University	0040053747	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Limestone College	0040054538	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lincoln Memorial University	0040054535	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lincoln University (Missouri)	0040061315	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Livingstone College	0040061488	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		

Votes By Attendee

Page: 51
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Livingstone College	0040061488	Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	0040061274	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Lone Star Conference	0040051780	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Lynn University	0040060941	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	0040061098	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Mars Hill College	0040060833	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Mercy College	0040008371	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Mercyhurst College	0040059708	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 52
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Mercyhurst College	0040059708	Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Merrimack College	0040060929	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Mesa State College	0040058691	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Metropolitan State College of Denver	0040042267	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Michigan Technological University	0040060720	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	0040048515	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Midwestern State University	0040058893	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 53
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Midwestern State University	0040058893	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	0040061103	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1				
		Test 2		1		
Minnesota State University (Mankato)	0040051107	Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
Minnesota State University Moorhead	0040048425	Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
Missouri Southern State University	0040058890	Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1		1	
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
Missouri Uni of Science and Technology	0040047533	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
Missouri Western State University	0040059559	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
Molloy College	0040047095	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 54
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Molloy College	0040047095	Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Montana State University-Billings	0040059216	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Morehouse College	0040050841	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Mount Olive College	0040058037	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
New Mexico Highlands University	0040042222	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
New York Institute of Technology	0040058984	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Newberry College	0040047923	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page:
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Newberry College	0040047923	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
No. Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	0040053386	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
North Georgia College & State University	0040058243	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northeast-10 Conference	0040053400	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northeastern State University	0040059619	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20			1	
Northern Kentucky University	0040061161	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Northern Michigan University	0040041077	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northern State University	0040058019	Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 56
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Northern State University	0040058019	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5			1	
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	0040053405	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Northwest Missouri State University	0040061474	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northwest Nazarene University	0040061470	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Northwood University (Michigan)	0040060870	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Nova Southeastern University	0040060978	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Nyack College	0040061469	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
			1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 57
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Nyack College	0040061469	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Ohio Valley University	0040061291	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
Oklahoma Panhandle State University	0040060625	Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
Ouachita Baptist University	0040061238	Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
Pace University	0040060624	Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
Paine College	0041031845	Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
Palm Beach Atlantic University	0040061150	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
		Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
Peach Belt Conference	0040051890	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 58
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Peach Belt Conference	0040051890	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	0040047183	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Pfeiffer University	0040060942	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Philadelphia University	0040061446	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Pittsburg State University	0040061353	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Post University	0040060633	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Queens College (New York)	0040060893	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 59
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Queens College (New York)	0040060893	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15			1	
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Queens University of Charlotte	0040053122	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Quincy University	0040053746	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Regis University (Colorado)	0040053801	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Rockhurst University	0040054539	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	0040058165	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Rollins College	0040054540	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Saginaw Valley State University	0040053217	Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 60
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Saginaw Valley State University	0040053217	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Saint Anselm College	0040060534	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Saint Leo University	0040053292	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Saint Michael's College	0040053116	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Salem International University	0040053124	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
San Francisco State University	0040053345	Proposal No. 3			1	
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Seattle Pacific University	0040053346	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 61
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Seattle Pacific University	0040053346	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Seattle University	0040053372	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10			1	
		Proposal No. 15			1	
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Shaw University	0040053303	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Shepherd University	0040053302	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	0040053113	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	0040054493	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Sonoma State University	0040053836	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 62
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
South Atlantic Conference	0040051757	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	0040054492	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
Southern Arkansas University	0040054491	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Southern Connecticut State University	0040054490	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	0040053835	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.	0040051803	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Southern New Hampshire University	0040054488	Proposal No. 3		1		
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Proposal 20		1		
Southwest Baptist University	0040054487	Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 63
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Southwest Baptist University	0040054487	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Southwest Minnesota State University	0040054486	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	0040053767	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Andrews Presbyterian College	0040054569	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Augustine's College	0040053797	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Cloud State University	0040054606	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
St. Edward's University	0040054568	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 64
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
St. Edward's University	0040054568	Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
St. Martin's University	0040054613	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Mary's University (Texas)	0040054612	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Paul's College	0040054611	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
St. Thomas Aquinas College	0040053737	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Stillman College	0040054603	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15			1	
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Stonehill College	0040054602	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Sunshine State Conference	0040051825	Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 65
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Sunshine State Conference	0040051825	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Tarleton State University	0040053636	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Texas A&M University-Commerce	0040052151	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	0040052121	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Texas Woman's University	0040053827	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Tiffin University	0040054463	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Truman State University	0040052270	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 66
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Truman State University	0040052270	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Tusculum College	0040054459	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Tuskegee University	0040052259	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Alabama in Huntsville	0040054458	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Alaska Anchorage	0040053702	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Alaska Fairbanks	0040054557	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9			1	
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Arkansas (Monticello)	0040053717	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Bridgeport	0040054556	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 67
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Bridgeport	0040054556	Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of California (San Diego)	0040054555	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Central Missouri	0040053751	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Central Oklahoma	0040053742	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Charleston (West Virginia)	0040054554	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Colorado (Colorado Springs)	0040054552	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Findlay	0040054432	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 68
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Findlay	0040054432	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Hawaii at Hilo	0040054570	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Indianapolis	0040053782	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Mary	0040052256	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Massachusetts at Lowell	0040052114	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Minnesota (Crookston)	0040053724	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Minnesota Duluth	0040054466	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Missouri (St. Louis)	0040061000	Proposal No. 3	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 69
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of Missouri (St. Louis)	0040061000	Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Montevallo	0040060685	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Nebraska at Kearney	0040060683	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Nebraska at Omaha	0040047837	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of New Haven	0040052379	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of North Alabama	0040060658	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	0040060653	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 70
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	0040060653	Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of North Dakota	0040060659	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Pittsburgh (Johnstown)	0040060914	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Puerto Rico (Cayey)	0040047916	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Puerto Rico (Mayaguez Campus)	0040058189	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Puerto Rico (Rio Piedras)	0040061351	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of South Carolina Aiken	0040058199	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of South Dakota	0040060638	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 71
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of South Dakota	0040060638	Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
University of Southern Indiana	0040060641	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Tampa	0040061157	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of the District of Columbia	0040042941	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20			1	
University of the Incarnate Word	0040060538	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of the Sciences in Philadelphia	0040060562	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of West Alabama	0040060620	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 72
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
University of West Alabama	0040060620	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of West Florida	0040053613	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of West Georgia	0040061254	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
University of Wisconsin (Parkside)	0040061256	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Upper Iowa University	0040061485	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Valdosta State University	0040061486	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Virginia State University	0040061487	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Virginia Union University	0040061345	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 73
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Virginia Union University	0040061345	Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8		1		
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Washburn University of Topeka	0040061297	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Wayne State College (Nebraska)	0040061240	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Wayne State University (Michigan)	0040060611	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	0040061480	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
West Liberty State College	0040061481	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
West Texas A&M University	0040061482	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal 20	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 74
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
West Texas A&M University	0040061482	Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	0040053198	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
West Virginia State University	0040061048	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Western New Mexico University	0040061368	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1		1		
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Western Oregon University	0040061379	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4		1		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Western State College of Colorado	0040061009	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5		1		
		Proposal No. 6		1		
		Proposal No. 7		1		
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10		1		
		Proposal No. 15	1			
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Western Washington University	0040061068	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Wheeling Jesuit University	0040060742	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			

Votes By Attendee

Page: 75
Date: 14 Jan 2008
Time: 12:06

Meeting: Division 2 Session

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Handset</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Invalid</u>
Wheeling Jesuit University	0040060742	Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Wingate University	0040061305	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20	1			
Winona State University	0040061306	Proposal No. 3	1			
		Proposal No. 4	1			
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	1			
		Proposal No. 5	1			
		Proposal No. 6	1			
		Proposal No. 7	1			
		Proposal No. 8	1			
		Proposal No. 9	1			
		Proposal No. 10	1			
		Proposal No. 15		1		
		Test 1	1			
		Test 2		1		
		Proposal 20		1		
Total		Proposal No. 3	258	9	2	
		Proposal No. 4	247	23		
		Proposal No. 5 - 1	251	19		
		Proposal No. 5	237	27	3	
		Proposal No. 6	268	1		
		Proposal No. 7	238	31		
		Proposal No. 8	237	29	1	
		Proposal No. 9	263		1	
		Proposal No. 10	249	16	3	
		Proposal No. 15	61	204	4	
		Test 1	261		1	
		Test 2		266		
		Proposal 20	89	177	2	

102nd Annual Convention
DIVISION III
LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS
SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals:

- Those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted;
- Those letters and words that appear in **bold** face are to be added; and
- Those letters and words that appear in normal text are unchanged from the current Division III legislation.]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE GROUPING

2008 NCAA Convention Division III Proposal No. 1 (No. 2-1) will be taken up during the opening business session at 4 p.m., Saturday, January 12. Voting delegates from members of the Association shall vote on this proposal, by roll-call vote, during the joint session.

**NO. 1 (NO. 2-1) ORGANIZATION — EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE — DUTIES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES**

Intent: To clarify the Executive Committee’s existing authority to adopt and implement policy.

Constitution: Amend 4.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll-call vote]

4.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

[4.1.1 unchanged.]

4.1.2 Duties and Responsibilities.

[4.1.2-(a) through 4.1.2-(d) unchanged.]

- (e) Act on behalf of the Association **by adopting and implementing policies** to resolve core issues and other Association-wide matters;

[4.1.2-(f) through 4.1.2-(m) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee [Division III Presidents Council (Management Council)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: The NCAA constitution charges the Executive Committee with overseeing Association-wide issues under Constitution Article 4.01.1. The constitution also charges that the Executive Committee, among other things, “shall act” on behalf of the Association to resolve core issues and Association-wide matters under Constitution Article 4.1.2. Under existing provisions of

the constitution, the Executive Committee has authority to act by adopting and implementing policies. Presidents and chancellors on the Executive Committee are charged with providing such leadership and may do so by policy. The amendment does not change the duties and responsibilities of the Executive Committee. Neither does the amendment expand the Executive Committee's authority or power.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III presidents or chancellors.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III presidents or chancellors and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 2 (NO. 2-6) RECRUITING — SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS — PRIVATELY OWNED CAMPS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAMPS — EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFF MEMBERS**

Intent: To permit prospective student-athletes to be employed at privately owned and institutional sports camps and clinics, provided all compensation received is for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services; further, to permit an institution's athletics department personnel to serve in any capacity in a privately

owned camp, clinic or coaching school at which prospective student-athletes are employed, provided the camp or clinic is open to the general public and does not give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.4, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

13.12.1.4 *Employment of Prospective Student-Athletes/No Free or Reduced Admission Privileges.* In operating a sports camp or clinic, an institution, members of its staff or a representative of its athletics interests shall not *employ* or give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade.

13.12.1.4.1 Exception — Employment After Acceptance for Enrollment and High School Graduation. An institution may employ a prospective student-athlete at its institutional sports camp and/or clinic only after the paid acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid and the prospective student-athlete's high school graduation.

[13.12.1.4.2 renumbered as 13.12.1.4.1, unchanged.]

13.12.1.4.32 **Concession Arrangement.** **A prospective or enrolled student-athlete, at his or her own expense, may not operate a concession to sell items related to or associated with the institution's camp. However, the institution may employ the prospective or enrolled student-athlete at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services.**

13.12.1.4.3.1 Prospective Student-Athlete. An institution may not permit or arrange for a prospective student-athlete, at the prospective student-athlete's own expense, to operate a concession to sell items related to or associated with the institution's camp.

13.12.1.4.3.2 Enrolled Student-Athlete. A student-athlete, at the student-athlete's own expense, may not operate a concession to sell items related to or associated with his or her institution's camp to campers or others in attendance because such an arrangement would be considered an extra benefit. However, the institution may employ the student-athlete at a reasonable rate to perform such services for the camp.

[13.12.1.4.4 through 13.12.1.4.5 renumbered as 13.12.1.4.3 through 13.12.1.4.4, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

13.12.2 **Employment at Camp or Clinic.**

13.12.2.1 Prospective Student-Athletes. **An institution may employ a prospective student-athlete at its**

institutional sports camp and/or clinic provided all compensation received by the prospective student-athlete is for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services.

[13.12.2.1 through 13.12.2.3 renumbered as 13.12.2.2 through 13.12.2.4, unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.4, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

13.12.4 Privately Owned Camp. An institution's athletics department personnel may *not* serve in any capacity (e.g., guest lecturer, consultant) in a privately owned camp, clinic or coaching school at which prospective student-athletes who have started the ninth grade are employed., **provided the camp or clinic operates in accordance with the following conditions:**

- (a) **The camp or clinic shall be open to the general public; and**
- (b) **The camp or clinic shall not give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade.**

[13.12.4.1 through 13.12.4.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: The original legislation prohibiting an institutional staff member from being involved in a privately owned camp or clinic if a prospective student-athlete is employed at the camp or clinic is overly restrictive as it relates to the modern structure and logistics of operating a camp or clinic. This legislation permits staff members at Division III institutions to be employed at privately owned camps or clinics, even if those camps or clinics also employ individuals whom have started the ninth grade. In addition, it permits institutional camps or clinics to employ a prospective student-athlete, provided he or she is paid at a rate commensurate with the going rate for similar services. In both the private or institutional camps and clinics, in order for an institutional staff member to be employed, the camp or clinic must be open to the general public (limited only by number and age) and cannot give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade. These stipulations help deter recruiting advantages for coaches working at elite-level camps.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 3 (NO. 2-5) RECRUITING — PUBLICITY — PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE'S VISIT — ADMISSIONS OFFICE EXCEPTION**

Intent: To permit an institution's admissions office to publicize campus visits of a prospective student-athlete in the same manner all prospect visits are publicized.

Bylaws: Amend 13.10.4, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

13.10.4 Prospective Student-Athlete's Visits. A member institution shall not publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospective student-athlete's visit to the institution's campus. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospective student-athlete's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per Constitution 2.8.1.

13.10.4.1 Exception. A member institution's admissions office may publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospective student-athlete's visit to the institution's campus provided the same manner of publicity is done for prospective students generally.

Source: Midwest Conference, American Southwest Conference, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Northern Athletics Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Part (f) of the Division III philosophy statement reads, "Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body." If admissions offices welcome all prospects to campus with publicity such as a marquee at their front door or a listing in a campus bulletin, prospective student-athletes should be afforded the same recognition and amenities. The current interpretation of the term "publicity" would not permit a prospective student-athlete's name to be listed in many instances. With this amendment, admissions offices would be permitted to publicize a prospective student-athlete's visit to campus provided the same efforts and arrangements are made for all prospects in general. Institutions would still be precluded from introducing a prospective student-athlete at a function that is attended by media representatives or open to the general public per Bylaw 13.10.5. Part (h) of the Division III philosophy statement reads, "Assure that athletics recruitment complies with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admission process." Compliance is often viewed in terms of over-stepping boundaries. Currently, Division III institutions cannot "comply" with their own admissions office's policies and procedures because current legislation prohibits them from routinely applying publicity for all prospects in a consistent manner.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Management Council): The Presidents Council and Management Council support this proposal and believe that student-athletes should not be excluded from publicity conducted by the admissions office for other groups of prospective students.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-4) RECRUITING — DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS**

Intent: To specify that electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent by, or on behalf of, a member of the institution's athletics department staff to a prospective student-athlete is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles.

Bylaws: Amend 13.02.8, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

13.02.8 Telephone Calls. *The definition of a telephone call includes a facsimile or other electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., e-mail, Instant Messenger, pages, text messaging).* **All electronically transmitted human voice exchange (including videoconferencing and videophones) shall be considered telephone calls. All electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail, facsimiles, Instant Messaging, text messaging and social networking Web sites) shall not be considered telephone calls.**

13.02.9 Electronic Transmissions. Electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent to a prospective student-athlete by, or on behalf of, a member of the institution's athletics department staff is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles. **All other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., Instant Messenger, text messaging and social networking Web sites) are prohibited.**

[13.02.9 renumbered as 13.02.10, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Management Council [Student-Athlete Advisory Committee]), Centennial Conference and New England Women's and Men's Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: The unlimited use of certain forms of electronic communication, such as instant messaging and text messaging, by athletics department staff members to contact prospective student-athletes has become problematic. Coaches feel compelled to contact prospective student-athletes constantly, prospective student-athletes are distracted at all hours of the day and night, and prospective student-athletes and their parents are bearing the significant costs involved with receiving text messages. In addition, instant messaging and text messaging further removes

the parents and the high school coaches from the recruiting process. Prohibiting institutions from sending these intrusive and impersonal forms of electronic communication to prospective student-athletes and returning to the more prominent use of telephone conversations, electronic mail sent to computers, and written correspondence will reduce the burdens that have been created with the overuse of text messaging sent to cell phones and other portable electronic communication devices.

Estimated Financial Impact: Potential for savings of time and money on text messaging.

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-9) AWARDS AND BENEFITS — ACADEMIC AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES — SIMILAR SERVICES**

Intent: To permit an institution to finance academic and other support services for student-athletes, provided similar services are provided or available to students in general.

Bylaws: Amend 16.3, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

16.3 Academic and Other Support Services. An institution may finance academic and other support services for student-athletes provided *such similar* services are provided or available to students in general.

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, American Southwest Conference, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Northern Athletics Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Current legislation relating to academic and other support services restricts institutions from providing services and/or conducting programming for student-athletes that is not identical to those services available to students generally. This proposed modification would permit institutions and/or conferences to provide student-athletes with programming and/or services that are "similar in nature" to those available to students in general, while at the same time, providing more flexibility for programming that is geared more specifically to the needs and interests of student-athletes.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Strategic Planning and Finance Committee): The Presidents Council and Strategic Planning and Finance Committee oppose this proposal and note that student-athletes should not be provided with academic and career counseling services that are separate or different from those provided to the general student body.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-11) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
GENERAL PLAYING SEASON
REGULATIONS — MAKE-UP CONTESTS
DURING CONFERENCE POSTSEASON
EVENTS**

Intent: To permit an institution to “make up” a conference postseason contest that has been suspended or canceled due to weather or other unforeseen circumstances, provided the contest is necessary to determine the conference champion or automatic qualifier to the NCAA championship.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.7, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

17.1.7 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports.

[17.1.7-(a) unchanged.]

(b) Make-up Contests. An institution is not permitted to extend the playing season to make up suspended or canceled games (*including excluding* contests that determine a conference champion or the automatic qualifier to the NCAA championships, **provided such contests are concluded not later than 6 p.m. local time of the competition on the date on which participants are selected for the NCAA championship**).

[17.1.7-(c) through 17.1.7-(i) unchanged.]

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Northern Athletics Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Currently, it is not permissible for institutions to extend the playing season (even by one day) to complete contests that have been suspended or canceled and are used to determine a conference champion or automatic qualifier to the NCAA championships. For example, if the final day of a conference’s postseason tournament was canceled due to inclement weather, it would not be permissible under the current legislation to complete the tournament (and in all likelihood determine the conference’s automatic qualifier) unless all of the participating institutions accounted for this possibility in the calculation of their playing season. The proposed amendment would allow for the extension of the playing season (which in most cases would be an extension of one day) in those instances in which the canceled or suspended contests are necessary to determine a conference champion and/or automatic qualifier to the NCAA championships.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee and Championships Committee oppose this proposal and note that

current legislation allows institutions and conferences the means to adjust their schedules in order to anticipate scenarios when a make-up contest might be necessary, by starting practice on a different day. In addition, the Council and committees note that a waiver process is available through the Administrative Review Subcommittee for institutions facing unique circumstances and have recommended that the NCAA staff and Administrative Review Subcommittee exercise greater flexibility when reviewing these waivers than has been previously exercised.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-12) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST DATE**

Intent: In basketball, to specify that a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition before November 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) against outside competition in basketball before *the Friday immediately before Thanksgiving November 15*, except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1.

Source: Capital Athletic Conference and State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: This proposal, which changes the first permissible contest date in basketball to November 15, would provide a consistent preseason practice period each year. Thus, practice may start October 15 and contests may begin November 15. Division I has already changed the date of its first permissible contest to the second Friday in November and Division II has changed its first permissible contest date to November 15. Division III previously changed the start of its first practice to October 15 in order to simplify and standardize the start of the preseason. Now, this change would simplify and standardize the first permissible contest date. This proposal would result in two of the three NCAA divisions having the same dates to start practice and to play their first game. Finally, a November 15 start date would relieve some conferences from playing three conference games in one week, which would avoid additional missed class time.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee oppose this proposal as it expands the playing season and would further discourage dual-sport student-athletes from participating in a sport other than basketball.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-7) ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY — REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that the participation of male practice players in a women's team sport shall be limited to the traditional segment in the sport and one practice per week; further, to specify that the number of male practice players who participate in a particular practice shall not exceed half the number of student-athletes of a typical starting unit in the sport, noting that any computation of half of the starting unit that results in a fractional portion of a player shall be rounded to the next whole number.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.11, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

14.1.11 Male Practice Player Eligibility. A male student who practices with a women's team is considered to be a student-athlete in that women's sport. The male student-athlete must be certified as eligible under all applicable NCAA eligibility requirements to participate (e.g., the individual must be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies, sign a student-athlete statement and drug-testing consent form and have eligibility remaining under the 10-semester rule). The male student-athlete is subject to all other restrictions and/or benefits as authorized by NCAA legislation. See Bylaw 14.2.4.7 for use of a season of participation.

14.1.11.1 Limitations on the Involvement of Male Practice Players — Team Sports. The use of male practice players in a women's team sport is subject to the following limitations:

- (a) Male practice players shall only be permitted to practice in the traditional segment in the women's sport;
- (b) The involvement of male practice players is limited to one practice per week; and
- (c) The number of male practice players who are involved during any particular practice shall not exceed half the number of student-athletes of a typical starting unit in that sport. Any computation of half of the starting unit that results in a fractional portion of a player shall be rounded up to the next whole number.

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: The involvement of male practice players has the potential to reduce practice opportunities for women as female student-athletes are relegated to the bench in favor of their teammates scrimmaging against males; however, male practice players also enable some women's teams with small rosters to field an appropriate number of players for competitive drills. Women's athletics have developed significantly in the past 25 years and it is no longer appropriate to rely on male practice players to serve as scout teams or to focus only on males to simulate a taller or faster female opponent. Following discussion at the 2007 NCAA Convention, which revealed the need for greater data to be gathered about the use of male practice players, a survey instrument was sent to Division III institutions. The results of that survey indicate that 54.9 percent of Division III institutions completing the survey favor some restrictions on the involvement of male practice players. Individual conferences or institutions that prefer a total prohibition on male practice players can still exercise their discretion whether to permit their involvement. It should be noted that existing legislation already requires that male practice players be certified as eligible under all applicable NCAA eligibility requirements (e.g., the individual must be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies, sign a student-athlete statement and drug-testing consent form and have eligibility remaining under the 10-semester/15-quarter rule). Further, under existing legislation, male practice players do use seasons of participation when participating with women's teams.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-3) PERSONNEL — CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS-SAFETY TRAINING**

Intent: To specify that at least one individual employed by the institution (including part-time, volunteer or graduate assistant coaches, but not including student employees who are not members of the athletics training staff) certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with the institution's emergency plan activation policies shall be present at each athletically related activity involving student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL.

[11.1.1 through 11.1.5 unchanged.]

11.1.6 Sports-Safety Training. At least one individual employed by the institution (including part-time, volunteer or graduate assistant coaches and students who are members of the training staff, but not

including student employees generally) certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with the institution's emergency plan activation policies shall be present at each athletically related activity (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) that involves physical activity.

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

17.1 GENERAL PLAYING-SEASON REGULATIONS.

[17.1.1 through 17.1.11 unchanged.]

17.1.12 Sports-Safety Presence. Each athletically related activity (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) that involves physical activity shall have present at least one individual employed by the institution (including part-time, volunteer or graduate assistant coaches and students who are members of the training staff, but not including student employees generally) certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with the institution's emergency plan activation policies.

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Legislation requiring first aid, CPR and AED certification supports the Division III philosophy statement, specifically the prong regarding student-athlete safety and well-being. A survey of the NCAA death claims since 1992 reports 60 percent of all nonvehicle-related deaths have been due to heart-related conditions and 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning. Safety and well-being of student-athletes are of the utmost concern and this proposal helps to strengthen those areas. Division III grant and initiative funding may be used to assist in funding the necessary certification courses. While the proposal does not require that an institution purchase an AED (only that an individual certified in AED use is present at athletically related activities), it is also important to note that Division III grant and initiative funding may be used to purchase an AED if an institution so desired.

Estimated Financial Impact: Minimal for certification (\$0 to \$30 per coach) since institutions can outsource the training or train their own staff members as instructors. Moreover, this is not an annual cost since first-aid certification is valid for three years and CPR certification is valid for one to two years. Division III grant and initiative funding may be used to offset these costs.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-16) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATIONS —
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS — USE
OF PROVISIONAL MEMBERS TO MEET
CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To permit an institution that was a provisional member prior to August 1, 2007, which has completed year one of provisional membership and any institution that will become a provisional member after August 1, 2007, to count towards the requirement of seven institutions sponsoring a sport in order for a conference to be eligible for automatic qualification.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.3, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

31.3.4.3 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

- (a) Been a multi-sport conference with a minimum of seven *active* institutions sponsoring the specified sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis *and that are eligible for the NCAA Division III championship*. Those seven institutions must have belonged to the multi-sport conference for a minimum of two years in order for the conference to be immediately eligible for automatic qualifications. An institution that has belonged to the multi-sport conference for at least two years may add the specified sport for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions and to be immediately eligible for an automatic qualification. If a new institution joins the conference in order for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions sponsoring the particular sport, the conference is subject to a two-year waiting period to become eligible for automatic qualification. **Institutions that were provisional members prior to August 1, 2007, who have completed year one of its provisional membership and any institutions that will become provisional members after August 1, 2007, may count towards the minimum number of seven required institutions; or**

[Remainder of 31.3.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: North Eastern Athletic Conference and North Atlantic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Conferences that welcome NCAA provisional or exploratory members have no incentive to do so until those members have completed four years of provisional membership, because they do not count toward the minimum number of required institutions for automatic qualification consideration. Currently, provisional and exploratory members must meet

NCAA regulations in their second year of provisional membership and as of August 1, 2007, all new provisional members must comply with NCAA regulations during the year immediately preceding their application. These institutions are meeting all NCAA standards of an active member institution. Therefore, these institutions should count towards the requirement of seven institutions sponsoring a sport for conferences to be eligible to receive the automatic qualification. While there is a value to the learning period for new members, these institutions often struggle with obtaining conference membership and regular conference play. For those provisional members already part of a conference, they are not recognized as valued members of the conference until they count toward automatic qualification criteria. These members bring valuable competition and are a vital part of conferences and should be counted in total numbers. Provisional members are and would still be unable to represent their conferences at the NCAA championships; however, there is no detriment to the NCAA membership process in counting these members towards the minimum requirements for automatic qualification.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council, Championships Committee and Membership Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council, Championships Committee and Membership Committee oppose this proposal because institutions in the provisional membership process are not eligible for championships participation in Division III, which is an important component in maintaining the integrity of the automatic qualification process. In addition, provisional institutions do not have to meet Division III sports sponsorship requirements in year one and only have to meet the sports sponsorship requirements, and not all Division III rules, during year two of the provisional process. Due to the education and time involved in the four-year provisional process, it is not appropriate for provisional institutions to count toward automatic qualification in the same way as active Division III member institutions.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 10-1 EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATIONS — ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS — COUNTING PROVISIONAL MEMBERS TO MEET CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To amend 2008 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 10 to specify that a conference that was eligible for automatic qualification in the previous academic year or a conference that is within the two-year grace period since its previous eligibility for automatic

qualification, may count institutions that have entered year three of the provisional membership process toward the minimum of seven institutions to be considered eligible for automatic qualification.

Administrative: Amend Proposal No. 10, 31.3.4.3, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

31.3.4.3 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

- (a) Been a multi-sport conference with a minimum of seven institutions sponsoring the specified sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis. Those seven institutions must have belonged to the multi-sport conference for a minimum of two years in order for the conference to be immediately eligible for automatic qualifications. An institution that has belonged to the multi-sport conference for at least two years may add the specified sport for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions and to be immediately eligible for an automatic qualification. If a new institution joins the conference in order for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions sponsoring the particular sport, the conference is subject to a two-year waiting period to become eligible for automatic qualification. *Institutions that were provisional members prior to August 1, 2007, who have completed year one of its provisional membership and any institutions that will become provisional members after August 1, 2007, may count towards the minimum number of seven required institutions* **A conference that was eligible for automatic qualification in the previous academic year or a conference that is within the two-year grace period (per Bylaw 31.3.4.3.1) since its previous eligibility for automatic qualification, may count institutions that have entered year three of the provisional membership process toward the minimum of seven institutions;** or

[Remainder of 31.3.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: North Eastern Athletic Conference and North Atlantic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This proposal amends 2008 NCAA Proposal No. 10 by recognizing that third- and fourth-year provisional institutions count in regional rankings for postseason play. This amendment also only allows conferences to use these institutions in order to maintain an existing automatic qualification rather than to earn new qualifiers.

Committee Position: This amendment-to-amendment was not submitted in time for an official committee position to be included in the NCAA Convention Official Notice. The Championships Committee and the Playing and Practice Seasons Sub-

committee will forward recommended positions to the Management and Presidents Councils for consideration during their pre-Convention meetings.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 11 (NO. 2-15) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION —
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS —
SINGLE-SPORT CONFERENCES**

Intent: To permit an existing single-sport conference to maintain its eligibility for automatic qualification to national championships, as specified.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.3, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

31.3.4.3 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

[31.3.4.3-(a) through 31.3.4.3-(b)-(3) unchanged.]

- (4) At least 50 percent of conference members must sponsor a minimum of three men's and three women's team sports. *As of August 1, 2003, single-sport conferences in existence before February 1, 1998 must maintain its membership (e.g., minimum of seven original members).*
- (5) **A single-sport conference in existence before February 1, 2007, must maintain its membership of seven active members.**

Source: North Atlantic Conference and Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008, for participation occurring on or after August 1, 2008.

Rationale: At the 1999 NCAA Convention, the membership adopted legislation which placed a moratorium on the creation of single-sport conferences. In October 2003, the NCAA Division III Championships Committee made an administrative change to the bylaw by adding the words "seven original members." This revision tightened the bylaw's language and limited fluctuation of membership. Institutions affected by the current legislation are limited in their options regarding membership movement and sponsorship. In recent years, single-sport conferences have lost and gained members based on sports sponsorship growth, multi-sport conference sponsorship and the creation of new championships for emerging sports such as women's ice hockey. This bylaw change will not allow the creation of any new single-sport conferences, but it will allow existing single-sport conferences, including emerging sports, to either maintain or gain automatic qualification based on new sports sponsorship, multi-sport conference sports sponsorship growth and sim-

ilar philosophies. With the original intent of the bylaw and last year's approval of a two-year grace period for a conference whose membership falls below seven institutions in a particular sport, the membership has voted two times to protect a conference's automatic qualification instead of restricting access to championships. Without this legislation, two of four women's ice hockey conferences will lose their automatic qualification.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

GENERAL GROUPING

**NO. 12 (NO. 2-8) ELIGIBILITY — SATISFACTORY-
PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS —
ONLINE COURSES**

Intent: To specify that the use of online courses for purposes of academic standing or satisfactory progress shall be determined by the regulations of the certifying institution as applied to all students, regardless of whether the online courses are taken through the certifying institution or through another institution.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.1, as follows:

14.4.1 Satisfactory-Progress Requirements.

[14.4.1.1 through 14.4.1.4 unchanged.]

14.4.1.5 Online Courses. Use of online courses for purposes of academic standing or satisfactory progress shall be determined by the regulations of the certifying institution, regardless of whether the online courses are taken through the certifying institution or through another institution.

[14.4.1.5 renumbered as 14.4.1.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Currently, the use of online courses is treated in the same manner as correspondence courses for purposes of the legislated academic standing and satisfactory-progress requirements. Such application of the legislation does not allow the use of online courses taken at institutions other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student. By allowing an institution to determine if online courses should be used in determining a student-athlete's academic standing or satisfactory progress, this proposal reflects the Division III philosophy that as a general requirement, satisfactory progress is to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the use of these academic courses for all students.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

**NO. 13 (NO. 2-13) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
PRESEASON PRACTICE —
TRADITIONAL SEGMENT — CROSS
COUNTRY, FIELD HOCKEY, GOLF,
RUGBY, SOCCER, TENNIS AND
WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: In cross country, field hockey, golf, rugby, soccer, tennis and women's volleyball, to eliminate the requirement that an institution calculate its first permissible date of practice by counting practice opportunities from September 1 when the first scheduled intercollegiate contest occurs prior to September 1.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2, as follows:

17.7.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in cross country before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.7.2-(b) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.2, as follows:

17.10.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in field hockey before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.10.2-(b) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.2, as follows:

17.12.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in golf before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.
 - (1) Exception. An institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall may commence practice on the date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate contest *or September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.12.2-(b) unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.18.2, as follows:

17.18.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice in rugby before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.18.2-(b) unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.20.2, as follows:

17.20.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice in soccer before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.20.2-(b) unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.2, as follows:

17.26.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in tennis before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.
 - (1) Exception. An institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall may commence practice on the date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities before the first scheduled intercollegiate contest *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.26.2-(b) unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.28.2, as follows:

17.28.2 Preseason Practice - Women. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in women's volleyball before the following dates:

- (a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game *or before September 1, whichever is later.*

[17.28.2-(b) unchanged.]

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Northern Athletics Conference and State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: Currently, institutions are permitted to play their first contest September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday. However, in so doing, institutions are limited to fewer than the allowable 16 practice opportunities afforded to those institutions that schedule their first contest September 1 or later. This amendment will allow institutions to have a consistent number of practice opportunities (i.e., 16) from year to year counting back from their first scheduled intercollegiate contest even if that contest is scheduled

prior to September 1. Further, this amendment will provide teams with the number of practice opportunities (i.e., 16) that has been deemed appropriate in preparation for competition. Finally, this amendment will result in considerably less confusion and misapplication of the current rules pertaining to the first permissible practice date in those years in which the first contest may be scheduled prior to September 1.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee support this proposal and note that current legislation already recognizes certain anomalies on the calendar, such as adjustments to accommodate for Labor Day weekend. It was also noted that there is some confusion related to the proper application of current legislation. Finally, it was noted that institutions remain subject to the 18-week limit within these sports.

Estimated Financial Impact: In some years, an institution that chooses to schedule its first contest prior to September 1 and elects to use all 16 permissible practice opportunities may experience some additional costs.

NO. 14 (NO. 2-10) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — COUNTABLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES — STRENGTH AND CONDITIONING COACH

Intent: To specify that a strength and conditioning coach who is also a coaching staff member for one of the institution's intercollegiate teams may monitor voluntary individual workouts without such workouts being considered athletically related activities only if that staff member performs monitoring duties for all student-athletes using the facility at that time.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1.1, as follows:

17.02.1.1.1 Exceptions. The following activities shall not be considered athletically related:

[17.02.1.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

- (e) Voluntary individual workouts monitored for safety purposes by strength and conditioning personnel. **If the strength and conditioning coach is also a coaching staff member for one of the institution's intercollegiate teams, the monitoring may occur only if that staff member performs monitoring duties for all student-athletes using the facility at that time.**

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008

Rationale: This proposal addresses concerns regarding the practice of designating multiple coaches, even multiple coaches from the same sport, as "strength and conditioning" coaches resulting in the monitoring of voluntary individual workouts of student-athletes they coach. In addition, the proposal ensures that the individual who is monitoring the workouts is able to provide safety oversight for all student-athletes involved in the workout.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

NO. 15 (NO. 2-2) LEGISLATIVE PROCESS — LEGISLATION — AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MEMBERSHIP — CO-SPONSORSHIP DEADLINE

Intent: To specify that a proposal submitted by 5 p.m. Eastern time July 15 sponsored by one conference or at least 10 of the 20 individual institutions may be available for co-sponsorship until 5 p.m. Eastern time September 1.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.5.3.1.1, as follows:

5.3.5.3.1.1 Amendment Proposed by Membership.

- (a) Annual Convention — 5 p.m. Eastern time July 15 (**at least one of the sponsors of a conference-sponsored amendments or at least 10 of the 20 individual institution sponsors** must meet the July 15 deadline, and the required president or chancellor *signatures approval* for these amendments must be received by 5 p.m. Eastern time August 1). **The second co-sponsor (i.e., either an additional conference or 10 individual institutions) must meet the deadline of 5 p.m. Eastern time September 1 or the amendment will be automatically withdrawn.**

[Remainder of 5.3.5.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, American Southwest Conference and Northern Athletics Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: To ensure broader support of proposed legislation, changes were made to the legislative process at the 2007 NCAA Convention which now requires a minimum of two conferences or 20 institutions to co-sponsor an amendment. Previously, one conference or eight institutions were required for a proposal to be sponsored. Because most conferences do not hold spring meetings until late May or early June and the commissioners do not meet as a group to discuss potential legislation until early to mid-June, the window to seek a co-sponsor is extremely narrow. This is further complicated by the fact that it occurs during a time of year when many athletics administrators, presidents and chancellors choose to travel or otherwise take time off at the conclusion of the academic year. This legislation would still require broader co-sponsorship, but allows conferences and institutions

to use the summer months to seek co-sponsors, to obtain the required signatures and to engage in dialogue that is necessary to make an informed decision about co-sponsorship.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee oppose this proposal and note that the volume of membership-sponsored proposals for the 2008 Convention is indicative of the viability of properly sponsoring legislative proposals within the current legislative calendar structure. The Councils and committee recommend that the membership take a couple of years to operate under the current requirements in order to gauge how well those requirements function. In addition, committees' and Councils' meeting agendas and discussions are set based on the current legislative calendar, which was developed in part to more efficiently conduct the necessary business of the Association.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

**NO. 16 (NO. 2-14) COMMITTEES — ASSOCIATION-WIDE
COMMITTEES — GENERAL
COMMITTEES — COMPETITIVE
SAFEGUARDS AND MEDICAL ASPECTS
OF SPORTS — TERM OF OFFICE, CHAIR**

Note: The Presidents Council intends to withdraw this proposal on the Convention floor based upon the adoption of Proposal No. NC-26.

Intent: To permit the chair of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports to exceed the four-year term limit, provided the individual becomes the committee chair with only one year or less remaining on his or her four-year term.

Bylaws: Amend 21.2.2, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

21.2.2 Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, Committee on.

[21.2.2.1 through 21.2.2.2 unchanged.]

21.2.2.3 Term of Office, Chair. The chair may remain on the committee for up to one additional year if the individual becomes the committee chair with only one year or less remaining on his or her four-year term.

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Service on the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports is a learning experience and a chair is generally not identified until the completion of two years of service on the committee. However, in some cases an individual is selected as chair with only one year remaining on the committee. The complexities and impact of the issues considered by this committee and the need for consistent, learned leadership require a chair who has had the opportunity to understand the complexities of the position and will enable the chair to provide a continuity of service. This extension would be used only when the chair is appointed with one year or less remaining on his or her term.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

	NC 10	Proposal No. 2	Proposal No. 3	Proposal No. 4	calling of vote Proposal No. 4	Proposal No. 5 (First Vote)	Proposal No. 5	Calling the Question	Proposal No. 6	Calling the Question for Proposal No. 6	Proposal No. 7	Proposal No. 8	Reconsideration	Reconsidering Proposal No. 5	Proposal No. 9	Proposal No. 10	Proposal No. 10-1	calling the question for Proposal 10-1	Proposal No. 11	Proposal No. 12	Proposal No. 13	Proposal No. 14	Proposal No. 15	Proposal No. 16
Adrian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Agnes Scott College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Albertus Magnus College	N	Y	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	
Albion College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Albright College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Alfred University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Allegheny College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	A	
Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Alma College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Alvernia College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Alverno College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
American Southwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Amherst College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	
Anderson University (Indiana)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Anna Maria College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Arcadia University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Augsburg College						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N		N	N		Y	N	Y	Y	
Augustana College (Illinois)		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y			Y	Y	Y	
Aurora University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Austin College	N	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Averett University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Babson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Baldwin-Wallace College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y		Y	Y	
Baptist Bible College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	
Bard College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Baruch College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Bates College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Bay Path College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			N	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	

Becker College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Beloit College	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N			Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Bethany College (West Virginia)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bethel University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y			Y	Y	Y	
Blackburn College	N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N			Y	Y	Y	N	
Bluffton University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Bowdoin College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y			Y	N	Y	Y	
Brandeis University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Bridgewater State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Brooklyn College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Bryn Mawr College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Buena Vista University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Buffalo State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Cabrini College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
California Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
California State University (East Bay)	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Calvin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Capital University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Carleton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Carnegie Mellon University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Carroll College (Wisconsin)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Carthage College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y		N	
Case Western Reserve University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Castleton State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			N	Y	N	N			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Catholic University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Cazenovia College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Cedar Crest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Centenary College (New Jersey)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Centennial Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	
Central College (Iowa)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Centre College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Chapman University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Chatham University	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Christopher Newport University	N		Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
City College of New York	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
City University of New York Athletic Conference							N	Y					Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Col	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Clark University (Massachusetts)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Clarkson University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Coe College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	N	

Colby College	N		Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Colby-Sawyer College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of Mount St. Joseph	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
College of Mount St. Vincent	N	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
College of New Rochelle	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
College of Saint Elizabeth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of St. Benedict	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of St. Catherine	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of St. Scholastica	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
College of Staten Island	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
College of Wooster	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Colorado College		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	
Commonwealth Coast Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Concordia College (Moorhead)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Concordia University (Wisconsin)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University Chicago						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University Texas	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Connecticut College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Cornell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	
Curry College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Daniel Webster College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Defiance College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Delaware Valley College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Denison University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
DePauw University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
DeSales University	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Dickinson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	N					Y	
Dominican University (Illinois)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Drew University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
D'Youville College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Earlham College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N			Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
East Texas Baptist University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Eastern Connecticut State University	N		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Eastern Mennonite University	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Eastern Nazarene College	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y		Y	N	
Eastern University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y		
Edgewood College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Elizabethtown College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Elmhurst College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Elmira College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Elms College	Y	N	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	N	A	

Emerson College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Emmanuel College (Massachusetts)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Emory and Henry College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Empire 8	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Endicott College	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	
Eureka College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Florham)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Ferrum College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Finlandia University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Fisk University	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Fitchburg State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Fontbonne University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Framingham State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Franklin College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Frostburg State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gallaudet University	N	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
George Fox University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gettysburg College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gordon College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Goucher College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Great Northeast Athletic Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Green Mountain College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		Y	N			Y	Y	Y	
Greensboro College	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Greenville College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Grinnell College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Grove City College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Guilford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Gustavus Adolphus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gwynedd-Mercy College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Hamilton College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	
Hamline University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hampden-Sydney College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	N	A	A		Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hanover College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hardin-Simmons University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hartwick College	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Haverford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference		Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Heidelberg College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	A	
Hendrix College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Hilbert College	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hiram College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	

Hobart College (William Smith College)	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hollins University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hood College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hope College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Howard Payne University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
Hunter College	N		Y	Y	Y	A				Y		Y												
Huntingdon College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Husson College	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y			Y	Y	Y	N			N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Illinois College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Illinois Wesleyan University	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N			A	Y	Y	Y	
Immaculata University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Iowa Intercol. Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ithaca College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N		N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
John Carroll University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Johns Hopkins University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Johnson and Wales University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Johnson State College	N	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Juniata College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Kalamazoo College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Kean University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Keene State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N			Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Kenyon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Keuka College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Keystone College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		Y					Y	Y	
Knox College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
La Grange College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
La Roche College	Y	Y	Y		Y	N			Y	Y	Y	A			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lake Forest College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	A	
Lakeland College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Landmark Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lasell College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lebanon Valley College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Lehman College City University of New York		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Lesley University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
LeTourneau University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	N			N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lewis & Clark College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	N	
Liberty League	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Linfield College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Little East Conference	N	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Loras College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Louisiana College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	

Luther College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Lycoming College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lynchburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Macalester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
MacMurray College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Maine Maritime Academy	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Manchester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Maranatha Baptist Bible College	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		A	Y	Y	Y	
Marian College (Wisconsin)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Marietta College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Martin Luther College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Mary Baldwin College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Marymount University (Virginia)	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Maryville College (Tennessee)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Maryville University of Saint Louis		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Marywood University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conferen	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
McDaniel College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
McMurry University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Medaille College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Medgar Evers College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A			Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Meredith College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Messiah College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Methodist University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Michigan Intercol. Ath. Assn.	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y		A	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Corp.	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Middlebury College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Midwest Conference		Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Millikin University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Mills College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	
Millsaps College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Milwaukee School of Engineering	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Misericordia University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Mississippi College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Monmouth College (Illinois)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Montclair State University	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Moravian College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Mount Holyoke College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	
Mount Ida College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y					N		Y	Y						

Mount Saint Mary College (New York)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y			Y	Y	N	
Mount Union College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Muskingum College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	A	
Nazareth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	A	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Neumann College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
New England College		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
New England Small College Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	
New England Women's & Men's Athletic Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A		N	Y	A	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
New Jersey Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
New Jersey City University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
New York City College of Technology	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
New York University	Y	Y	Y		A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	A		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Newbury College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Nichols College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	
North Atlantic Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
North Carolina Wesleyan College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	N	Y			N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
North Central College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
North Coast Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	N	N	N	A	A	N	A			N			Y	A	Y	
North Eastern Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
North Park University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Northern Athletics Conference	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Northland College	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y		Y	Y	
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Norwich University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	
Oberlin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Occidental College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Oglethorpe University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Athletic Conference							Y	Y			N	Y	Y		Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Northern University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Wesleyan University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Old Dominion Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Olivet College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Otterbein College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Pacific University (Oregon)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
Peace College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Penn State University (Altoona)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Pennsylvania State Univ. Erie (the Behrend College)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Philadelphia Biblical University		Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Piedmont College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	

Pine Manor College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	
Plattsburgh State University of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Plymouth State University	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Polytechnic University (New York)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N		N	N		Y	N	Y	N	
Presidents' Athletic Conference	N	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Principia College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Ramapo College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N		N	Y			Y	Y	Y	
Randolph College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Randolph-Macon College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Regis College (Massachusetts)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	
Rhode Island College	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rhodes College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Ripon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N			N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Rivier College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Roanoke College	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Rochester Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rockford College	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Roger Williams University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	N	Y		
Rosemont College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rowan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
Russell Sage College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rust College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Rutgers The State Univ. of New Jersey (Camden)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rutgers The State Univ. of New Jersey (Newark)	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Saint Joseph's College (Maine)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Saint Mary's College (Indiana)		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Salem State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Salisbury University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Salve Regina University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Schreiner University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Shenandoah University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Simpson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
Skidmore College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	
Skyline Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Smith College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	A		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Southern Vermont College	N	Y	Y	N	A	A			Y	Y	Y													

Southwestern University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Spelman College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Springfield College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
St. John Fisher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. John's University (Minnesota)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. Joseph's College (Long Island)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
St. Mary's College of Maryland	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. Norbert College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
St. Olaf College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at Brockport	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at Cortland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at Fredonia	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
State University College at Geneseo	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at New Paltz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at Oneonta	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University College at Potsdam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University of New York at Farmingdale	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University of New York at Oswego	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University of New York Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
State University of New York Maritime College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Stevens Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Suffolk University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Sul Ross State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Susquehanna University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Swarthmore College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Texas Lutheran University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
The College of New Jersey	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
Thiel College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Thomas College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Thomas More College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Transylvania University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y			Y	Y	N	
Trinity College (Connecticut)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Trinity College (District of Columbia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Trinity University (Texas)		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Tri-State University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Tufts University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	

Union College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
University Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of California (Santa Cruz)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Chicago	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Dallas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Dubuque	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of La Verne	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Maine (Farmington)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	Y	N	Y			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
University of Mary Washington		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Massachusetts (Boston)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Massachusetts (Dartmouth)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of New England	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Pittsburgh (Bradford)	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Pittsburgh (Greensburg)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Redlands		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Rochester	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Scranton	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	
University of Southern Maine	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y			N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Texas at Dallas		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Texas at Tyler	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	
University of the Ozarks (Arkansas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
University of the South	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
University of Wisconsin (Eau Claire)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (La Crosse)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Oshkosh)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Platteville)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (River Falls)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Stevens Point)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Stout)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Superior)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin (Whitewater)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ursinus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
USA South Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Utica College			Y	Y		N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Vassar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Villa Julie College	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Wabash College		Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wartburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Washington and Jefferson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y		Y	N	N	N	

Washington and Lee University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Washington College (Maryland)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Washington University (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Waynesburg University	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Webster University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	N		Y			Y	
Wellesley College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Wells College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wentworth Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	
Wesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Western Connecticut State University		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y		Y	
Western New England College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			N		N	Y						
Westfield State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		N	Y	Y	N	
Westminster College (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Westminster College (Pennsylvania)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wheelock College	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Whitman College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Whittier College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			A		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Whitworth University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Widener University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Wilkes University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Willamette University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
William Paterson University of New Jersey	N	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
Williams College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	
Wilmington College (Ohio)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wilson College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wisconsin Lutheran College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wittenberg University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Worcester State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Yeshiva University	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
York College (New York)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y		N	N		Y	Y	N	Y	
York College (Pennsylvania)	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
YES	175	425	442	362	396	215	238	403	312	421	248	223	203	273	176	0	185	370	0	424	413	426	292	0
NO	243	13	5	72	35	215	188	22	133	21	185	206	229	152	256	0	252	75	0	12	29	16	145	0
ABSTAIN	13	2	1	2	7	8	7	4	1	2	7	17	3	2	12	0	7	0	0	2	0	1	9	0
TOTAL	431	440	448	436	438	438	433	429	446	444	440	446	435	427	444	0	444	445	0	438	442	443	446	0

The NCAA salutes the more than
380,000 student-athletes
participating in **23 sports** at
more than **1,000** member institutions

